

FAIRFAX COUNTY JUVENILE AND DOMESTIC RELATIONS DISTRICT COURT



ANNUAL STATISTICAL REPORT



FISCAL YEAR 2002
JULY 2001 TO JUNE 2002

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS



Katherine K. Hanley
Chair

Sharon Bulova
Braddock District

Gerald E. Connolly
Providence District

Cathy M. Hudgins
Hunter Mill District

Michael R. Frey
Sully District

Penelope A. Gross
Mason District

Gerald W. Hyland
Vice Chair
Mt. Vernon District

Dana Kauffman
Lee District

Elaine McConnell
Springfield District

Stuart Mendelsohn
Dranesville District

Anthony H. Griffin
County Executive

Verdia Haywood
Deputy County Executive
for Human Services

4000 Chain Bridge Road ★ Fairfax, Virginia 22030

For general Court information call:
703-246-3176 or 703-246-3177

PREFACE



This Annual Statistical Report for FY 2002 reviews the activity of the Court and the work of its 352 State and county employees.

With changes in the demographic characteristics of Fairfax County and its increasing urbanization, changing family structures, and the impact of a number of other local, regional, and national trends, the Court and its staff finds itself dealing with increasingly complex and difficult case problems. Although the total volume of cases coming to the Court's attention, with the exception of juvenile traffic offenses, has remained relatively stable, the serious problems these cases present to the Court and its staff

stretch its resources. Grant funding has provided some additional resources for work with domestic violence, truancy cases, and with aftercare and intensive supervision services.

Special appreciation for the writing and production of this report is extended to the Court's research analysts, Carissa Pappas and Katherine Williams, and to research assistant, Tina Casper from the Chief Judge, Charles Maxfield and Court Directors, Madeline Arter and Jim Dedes.

The Court and its services continue to grow and change as staff face the future. Its effectiveness is in great measure a credit to the quality of the dedicated judges, clerks, and service staff who must balance the need to protect the community with the need to provide for the protection and well-being of the youths and families who come within its jurisdiction.



JUVENILE AND DOMESTIC RELATIONS DISTRICT COURT

FY 2002 STAFF



JUDGES

4000 Chain Bridge Road ★ Fairfax, Virginia 22030 ★ 703-246-3367

Charles J. Maxfield, *Chief Judge*

Michael J. Valentine, *Judge*

Jane P. Delbridge, *Judge*

David S. Schell, *Judge*

Gayl Branum Carr, *Judge*

Teena D. Grodner, *Judge*

Kimberly J. Daniel, *Judge*

CLERK'S OFFICE

4000 Chain Bridge Road ★ Fairfax, Virginia 22030 ★ 703-246-3367

Jennifer W. Flanagan, *Clerk of Court*

Emelin M. Beach, *Chief Deputy Clerk*

DEPUTY CLERKS:

Nicole Angelo
Blanche F. Bailey
Patricia Berry
April Colon
Jessica Cullen
Ann Day
Christine Dumphy
Sue Finch
Lyndon Gonzalez
Ruth Hill
Mary Howard
Judith Lanham
Sharon Leasure
Pauline Lyon
Claudia Malenich
Janice Makely

Andrea O'Donnell
Mel Oelze
Marie Osma
Shannon Pachas
Ramon Palacios
Laura Powers
Janice Remick
Vivian Rigney
Astrid Soletto
Shacona Spinner
Tiffany Tickle
Debbie Thomas
Sheila Tingen
Debbie Toland
Madge Weese
Mary Wimmer

FY 2002 STAFF



COURT SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

4000 Chain Bridge Road ★ Fairfax, Virginia 22030 ★ 703-246-3343

James S. Dedes, *Co-Director* Madeline Arter, *Co-Director*

David Bartee, *Financial Analyst*

Letha Braesch, *Management Analyst*

Tom Burger, *Technical Support Analyst*

Angie Carrera, *Coordinator, Volunteer Sponsor Program*

Sheila Coffin, *Restitution Counselor*

Dorene Griffin,* *Personnel Specialist*

Paula Griffeth, *Administrative Assistant, Volunteer Sponsor Program*

Maureen Houser, *Victim Services Coordinator*

Deborah Kamins, *Restitution Counselor*

Elizabeth Kephart,* *Office Service Manager*

Kim McCarthy, *Director of Administrative Services*

Hory Outhuok, *Public Information Clerk*

John William Outlaw,* *Network Telecommunications Analyst*

Carissa Pappas, *Research Assistant*

Catherine Randall,* *Account Clerk*

Gwen Robinson, *Volunteer Coordinator*

Sandy Sood, Ph.D., *Training Coordinator*

George Spack, *Director of Court Information Technology*

Carol Stankosky, *Administrative Assistant*

Rae Ann Stein, *Records Manager*

Mony Thaivalappil, *Records Clerk*

Praveen Thaivalappil, *Records Clerk*

Ann Todd, *Administrative Assistant*

Quan Tran, *Accountant*

Calvin Williams,* *Computer Systems Analyst*

Katherine Williams, Ph.D., *Research Analyst*

Nuria Trigueros-Zepeda, *Public Information Clerk*

* *Human Services Administration assigned to Juvenile Court*

FY 2002 STAFF



PROBATION SERVICES

4000 Chain Bridge Road ★ Fairfax, Virginia 22030 ★ 703-246-3343

James S. Dedes, *Director for Probation Services*

Bill Goodman, *Probation Supervisor* ★ Amber Perrin, *Administrative Assistant*

NORTH COUNTY SERVICES

1850 Cameron Glen Drive, Suite 400
Reston, Virginia 22090 ★ 703-481-4014

Rice Lilley, *Unit Director*

Tracey Chiles, *Assistant Director*

Carol Benedict, *Administrative Assistant*

Evelyn Hamilton, *Administrative Assistant*

Linda Hall, *Administrative Assistant*

COUNSELORS:

Betsy Harris-Layton

Julie Mayer

Bridgette Peterson

Ed Nies

Joanna Balasco-Russell

Melissa Sorensen

Mary Wheatley

Ailsa Ware

HIGH SCHOOL AREAS SERVED:

★ Chantilly ★ Herndon ★ Oakton

★ South Lakes ★ Westfields

SOUTH COUNTY SERVICES

8350 Richmond Highway, Suite 119
Alexandria, VA 22309 ★ 703-704-6004

Roxanne Tigh, *Unit Director*

Jack Chapman, *Assistant Director*

Diana Harrison, *Administrative Assistant*

David Pierce, *Administrative Assistant*

COUNSELORS:

Dorothy Bock

Kenneth Brown

Tracey Guard

Shannon Hanekamp

Tom Jackson

West Johnson

Daniel Lanham

Ray Matthew

Shireen Plaseied

HIGH SCHOOL AREAS SERVED:

★ Edison ★ Hayfield ★ Lee ★ Mount Vernon ★ West Potomac

EAST COUNTY SERVICES

(this office opened 12/01)

2812 Old Lee Highway, Suite 100
Fairfax, Virginia 22030 ★ 703-204-1016

Dave Rathbun, *Unit Director*

Vicki Goode, *Assistant Director*

Geraldine Lee, *Administrative Assistant*

Denise Straub, *Administrative Assistant*

COUNSELORS:

Heydi Baptista

Bill Porter

Ed Ryan

Khanh Tran

John Wrightson

HIGH SCHOOL AREAS SERVED:

★ Falls Church ★ Madison ★ Langley

★ McLean ★ Marshall ★ Stuart

CENTER COUNTY SERVICES

10426 Main Street
Fairfax, Virginia 22030 ★ 703-383-1391

Robert A. Bermingham, *Unit Director*

Bob Smith, *Assistant Director*

Joyce White, *Administrative Assistant*

Lucinda Ross, *Administrative Assistant*

COUNSELORS:

Lisa Downing

Frank Fonte

John King

Stephanie Marshall

Lisa Sibenik-Alonso

Steve Spero

John Thompson

Gene Whitlock

Lori Winter

Erlinda Work

HIGH SCHOOL AREAS SERVED:

★ Annandale ★ Centreville ★ Fairfax ★ Lake Braddock

★ Robinson ★ West Springfield ★ W. T. Woodson

SPECIAL SERVICES

4000 Chain Bridge Road ★ Fairfax, Virginia 22030 ★ 703-246-2343

James McCarron, *Unit Director* ★ Gerald Jackson, *Parole Supervisor*

Tina Casper, *Administrative Assistant* ★ Michelle Grimsley, *Administrative Assistant*

COUNSELORS:

Nancy Brown, *Diagnostic Team/Special Placement Counselor*

Christine Butler, *Intensive Supervision Program*

Carol Coile, *Work Training Program Counselor*

Fran Davison, *Parole Counselor*

Kris Eckard, *Parole Counselor*

Martha Estell, *Psychological/Special Placements Counselor*

Patrice Johnson, *Community Service Program*

Lashawn Lewis, *Community Service Program*

Ray Matthew, *Intensive Supervision Program*

Michell McPhatter, *Community Service Program*

Maria Price, *Community Service Program*

Michelle SuLeiman, *Parole Counselor*

Dwight Smith, *Parole Counselor*

Chavis Teal, *Intensive Supervision Program*

Julian Wiles, *Parole Counselor*

Stuart Younkin, *Intensive Supervision Program*

FY 2002 STAFF



PROBATION SERVICES

FAMILY SYSTEMS COUNSELING AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE ASSESSMENT

4000 Chain Bridge Road
Fairfax, Virginia 22030 ★ 703-246-2204
Nanette M. Hoback, *L.C.S.W., Director*
Reen Lyddane, *L.P.C. LMFT, Assistant Director*
Margaret Reichardt, *Administrative Assistant*
JoAnn Tershak, *Administrative Assistant*

COUNSELORS:

Francis Bell, *M.S.*
Maritzabel Rodriguez-Hill, *L.C.S.W.*
Phyllis Robinson, *L.P.C.*
Sheila Birnbach (*part-time*), *L.C.S.W.*
Megan McLaughlin (*volunteer*)

SUBSTANCE ABUSE ASSESSMENT TEAM:

Lynne Koval, *CSAC, CAC*
Raelita Guilliams, *CSAC*
Leslie Malone, *CAC*

DOMESTIC RELATIONS SERVICES

4000 Chain Bridge Road
Fairfax, Virginia 22030 ★ 703-246-3040
Laura Harris, *Unit Director*
Jerry Rich, *Assistant Director of Intake Services*
Frank Sedei, *Assistant Director/Adult Probation Services*
Paulette Abbou, *Administrative Assistant*
Kathryn Scully, *Administrative Assistant*
Anne Phillips, *Administrative Assistant*

COUNSELORS:

Fran Blumenkrantz, *Intake Officer*
Lisa Bell, *Probation Counselor*
Linda Bozoky, *Intake Officer*
Linda Cecca, *Intake Officer*
Michael DeLoach, *Probation Counselor**
Lois Duncan, *Probation Counselor**
Celia Goldberg, *Probation Counselor**
William Montez Gray, *Intake Officer*
Lyn Jagger, *Custody Investigator*
Tom Kitsoulis, *Probation Counselor*
Pilar Leon, *Victim Service Counselor*
Richard Manley, *Probation Counselor*
Regina Morris, *Probation Counselor*
Ellis Roby, *Probation Counselor*
Rachael Navatta, *Custody Investigator (part-time)*

**DCJS grant-funded*

JUVENILE INTAKE SERVICES

4000 Chain Bridge Road
Fairfax, Virginia 22030 ★ 703-246-2495

Dennis Fee, *Unit Director*
Theo Vaughn, *Assistant Unit Director*
Pam Williams, *Administrative Assistant*
Chirag Bhavsar, *Administrative Assistant*
Fanny Burke, *Administrative Assistant*
Betsey Curilla, *Administrative Assistant*
Sinitra DeHaven, *Administrative Assistant*
Debbie Groves, *Administrative Assistant*
Gwen Korkolis, *Administrative Assistant*
Julie Smith, *Administrative Assistant*
Roger West, *Administrative Assistant*

COUNSELORS:

Libby Burge, *Night Intake Counselor (part-time)*
Iris Speed Batts, *Overnight Intake Counselor*
Fran Deloatche, *Intake Counselor*
Don Devers, *Night Intake Counselor*
Craig James, *Overnight Intake Counselor*
Kate Freeman, *Intake Counselor (part-time)*
Pam Harney, *Overnight Intake Counselor (part-time)*
Nancy Heacock, *Intake Counselor (part-time)*
Elaine Lassiter, *Intake Counselor (part-time)*
John Miller, *Hearing Officer*
Paula Palmer-King, *Overnight Intake Counselor*
Amy Sommer, *Intake Counselor*
Ann Stanford, *Weekend Intake Counselor*
Dedra Vignola, *Intake Counselor*
Elizabeth Wood, *Intake Counselor*



FY 2002 STAFF



RESIDENTIAL SERVICES

4000 Chain Bridge Road ★ Fairfax, VA 22030 ★ 703-246-3416

Madeline Arter, *Director for Residential Services*

Evelyn Oliver, *Administrative Assistant*

GIRLS PROBATION HOUSE

12720 Lee Highway ★ Fairfax, Virginia 22030
703-830-2930

Mary Brantley, *Director*

Myrna Brown-Wiant, *Assistant Director*

Phyllis Hale, *Administrative Assistant*

COUNSELORS:

Ron Barr	Michelle Keegan
Francis Bell	Katherine Miracle
Lauren Cassel	Greg White
Ana Conrad	Sandra Whitacre, <i>Cook</i>
Michelle Harmon	

SUPERVISED RELEASE SERVICES

4000 Chain Bridge Road ★ Fairfax, Virginia 22030
703-246-2200

Scott Warner, *Supervisor*

Millie Hamilton, *Administrative Assistant*

COUNSELORS:

George Ashley	Marion Mills
Adrienne Broitman	Julius Reynolds
Joseph Diseati	Susan Schiffer
Leslie Gamara	Bill Willis
Frank Gorey	Heather Zeitner
Motisola Inge	

BOYS PROBATION HOUSE

4410 Shirley Gate Road ★ Fairfax, Virginia 22030
703-591-0171

Lorraine Peck, *Program Director*

Mitchell Ryan, *Assistant Director*

Wardlee Liberti, *Administrative Assistant*

Marlon Murphy, *Program Coordinator (TLP)*

Sher Singh, *Cook*

THERAPEUTIC UNIT:

Lynn Baird	Duane Miller
Michelle Beaudry	Karen Roberts
Lauren Cassel	Romeo Ruddock
Joe Himmelberg	(overnight)
Jeff Hurlich	Matt Thompson
Eric Jay (overnight)	

TRANSITIONAL LIVING PROGRAM:

Tom Hastings	Georgina Thompson
Greg Harper	

FAMILY COUNSELORS:

Teresa Athing	Kim Scarborough-Sykes
---------------	-----------------------

LESS SECURE SHELTER

10650 Page Avenue ★ Fairfax, Virginia 22030
703-246-2900

Peter Roussos, *Program Director*

Ivy Tillman, *Assistant Director*

LaVerne Hovley, *Administrative Assistant*

Cynthia Lucas, *Administrative Assistant*

COUNSELORS:

Dorothy Kress-Bullock	Tom Petruzzi
Timothy Korab	Katrina Smith
Michelle McPhatter	Allison Taylor
Michael McNulty	Henley Thomas
Michael Miracle	DeRon Vinson
Graham Perkovich	

FY 2002 STAFF



JUVENILE DETENTION CENTER

10650 Page Avenue ★ Fairfax, Virginia 22030 ★ 703-246-2844

George Corbin, *Superintendent*

Karen Bisset, George Corbin, and David Grabauskas, *Assistant Superintendents*

Selvin Alvarez, *Outreach Worker II*
Dake Amenyah, *Outreach Worker II*
Brian Anderson, *Outreach Worker II*
Raymond Anderson, *Probation Counselor II*
Jamaine Arvin, *Probation Counselor I*
Robin Baker, *Outreach Worker II*
Patricia Beamer, *Cook*
Steven Berger, *Outreach Worker II*
Bruce Berry, *Probation Counselor I*
Meghann Bortel, *Outreach Worker II*
John Brown, *Operations Manager*
Gabriel Caldera, *Administrative Assistant III*
Scott Carter, *Probation Counselor I*
David Chambers, *Outreach Worker II*
Denise Clark, *Outreach Worker II*
Timothy Clark, *Probation Counselor I*
Andrea Curry, *Food Service Supervisor*
Jessica Curtis, *Probation Counselor I*
Rommel Custode, *Maintenance Trade Helper II*
Chaneta D'Angelo, *Outreach Worker I*
Rodney Douglas, *Probation Counselor I*
Lori Downing, *Outreach Worker II*
Beckha Drake, *Outreach Worker II*
Troy Evans, *Probation Counselor I*
Crystal Farris, *Outreach Worker II*
Anthony Fegans, *Outreach Worker II*
Timothy Ferrell, *Operations Manager*
Erin Finnerty, *Outreach Worker II*
Carl Fogle, *Shift Administrator*
Jeffrey Freeman, *Outreach Worker II*
Harry Fulwiler, *Post Dispositional Coordinator*
Stephen Garland, *Outreach Worker II*
Freddie Gaskins, *Assistant Operations Manager*
Brian Gerber, *Outreach Worker II*
James Gestrich, *Overnight Supervisor*
John Gore, *Probation Counselor I*
David Groce, *Assistant Operations Manager*
Eric Gustafson, *Outreach Worker II*

Tariq Hall, *Outreach Worker II*
Aaron Hamlett, *Outreach Worker II*
Chris Hardmon, *Probation Counselor I*
Timothy Hardy, *Outreach Worker II*
Daud Harris, *Outreach Worker II*
Charles Harrison, *Outreach Worker II*
James Harrison, *Shift Administrator*
Howard Harvey, *Probation Counselor I*
Leighton Henry, *Outreach Worker II*
Kevin Herman, *Probation Counselor I*
Anthony Heyward, *Outreach Worker II*
Yvonne Hines, *Cook*
Mike Holder, *Building Supervisor*
Henry Houston, *Outreach Worker II*
Jason Houtz, *Operations Manager*
Aaron Hughes, *Outreach Worker II*
Darrius Hunter, *Outreach Worker II*
Bobby Huntley, *Operations Manager*
Charles Hutson, *Outreach Worker II*
Motisola Inge, *Probation Counselor I*
Jim Jindra, *Probation Counselor I*
Brian Jones, *Outreach Worker II*
Donald Jones, *Probation Counselor I*
Kendall Jones, *Outreach Worker II*
Mark Jones, *Transportation Supervisor*
Robert Joumas, *Probation Counselor I*
Linda Kerns, *Administrative Assistant III*
Robert Kim, *Cook*
Erick King, *Probation Counselor I*
Elaine Lassiter, *Child Services Coordinator*
Randy Lassiter, *Operations Manager*
Nicolas Ledon, *Outreach Worker II*
Adam Leibman, *Outreach Worker II*
Laurie Ligon, *Outreach Worker II*
Steve Logan, *Probation Counselor I*
Stacy McCall, *Outreach Worker II*
Greg McKnight, *Probation Counselor I*
Thomas McLachlan, *Food Service Specialist*
Jai-Ahmal Mitchell, *Outreach Worker II*
George Morita, *Probation Counselor I*
Christopher Moskal, *Outreach Worker II*
Patricia Motley, *Outreach Worker II*
Edith Murray, *Probation Counselor II*

Rana Natour, *Administrative Assistant III*
Hally Nguyen, *Laundress*
Annessa N'Kere, *Outreach Worker II*
Bennie Oliver, *Outreach Worker II*
Hilton Patrick, *Probation Counselor I*
James Pawlak, *Assistant Operations Manager*
John Plews, *Probation Counselor I*
Barbara Quach, *Cook*
Lisa Prater, *Outreach Worker II*
Bob Rankin, *Operations Manager*
Anthony Reed, *Outreach Worker II*
Cathleen Robertson, *Nurse*
Joy Roby, *Post-D Aftercare Counselor*
Janet Sakraida, *Nurse*
Allieu Sanu, *Cook*
Jeanette Saucier, *Cook*
Christina Sharpe, *Outreach Worker II*
David Shreve, *Probation Counselor I*
Robert Simpson, *Outreach Worker II*
Jack Sorto, *Outreach Worker II*
Sharon Spates-Miller, *Probation Counselor I*
Enio Tapia, *Assistant Operations Manager*
Moe Thu, *Cook*
Randy Tisdale, *Outreach Worker II*
Wyatt Trumbo, *Probation Counselor I*
Reginald Tucker, *Probation Counselor I*
Annette Twyman, *Probation Counselor I*
Jimmy Vasquez, *Outreach Worker II*
Sherry Vaughan, *Probation Counselor I*
Ignacio Villas, *Outreach Worker II*
Brad Watson, *Probation Counselor I*
Malcolm Watts, *Outreach Worker II*
Leo White, *Probation Counselor I*
Sherman White, *Outreach Worker II*
Mike Wiener, *Operations Manager*
Larry Wiley, *Assistant Operations Manager*
Dwayne Williams, *Outreach Worker II*
Sonya Williams, *Probation Counselor I*
Ricky Wilson, *Outreach Worker II*
Eric Woods, *Outreach Worker II*

FY 2002 RETIRED STAFF



LIBBY BURGE transferred to the Juvenile Court from the police department in July 1888. She worked as a Night Intake Counselor until her retirement in January 2002.

BARBARA DAYMUDE began her career with the Court in 1974. She retired as the Clerk of the Court in February 2001 after 27 years of service.

JOSEPH FEDELI began his 26 year career with the Court in May 1975 as the Director of Girls Probation House. Joe became the Director of Residential Services in 1995. Along with Jim Dedes, Joe co-directed the Juvenile Court until his retirement in February 2001.

JERRY JACKSON began his 28 year career with the county in October 1974 as a probation officer in the Center County Probation Unit. He transferred to Special Services in 1998.

Jerry ended his career with the Court on August 19, 2002 as the Parole Supervisor in Special Services. Jerry continues to help children in his new position as a Guidance Counselor at West Springfield High School.

DWIGHT SMITH came to the Court after retiring from the Maryland Department of Juvenile Justice as a probation supervisor. He began his employment in Fairfax as a relief probation counselor with South County. Dwight transferred to a full-time position with Special Services as a parole counselor in October 1996. Dwight retired from this position in April 2002. Sadly, Dwight lost his battle with cancer later that same year.

MARILYN WEEKS came to the Court in 1964. After 37 years of dedicated service, she retired as the Chief Deputy Clerk in April of 2001.



DAYMUDE



FEDELI



JACKSON



SMITH



WEEKS



JUVENILE COURT CITIZENS ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBERS

Janet Muldoon, *Braddock District, Chair*

HUNTER MILL DISTRICT

Patricia H. Brandon
Bryon Wong

MT. VERNON DISTRICT

Frederick M. Joyce

PROVIDENCE DISTRICT

Keil Green

CITY OF FAIRFAX

George Ashley
John J. Harold

LEE DISTRICT

Jenna Mehnert

SPRINGFIELD DISTRICT

Judith Isom, *Vice Chair*
Cindy Joy-Rogers

DRANESVILLE DISTRICT

Elizabeth Ramage

MASON DISTRICT

Deborah Foreman

SULLY DISTRICT

Caroline Kerns

AT-LARGE

Doreen Williams

COURT APPOINTEE

Corrine Lockett, *Vice Chair*
Joseph Beale
Alene Grabauskas
Tom Harrington
Andrew Kersey
Marsha Kiser

HONORARY

Helen Hester

TABLE OF CONTENTS



	Page
Preface	i
FY 2002 Court Staff	ii
Juvenile Court Citizens Advisory Council Members	viii
I. GENERAL OVERVIEW	3
Historical Background	3
Budget and Personnel	3
II. AGENCY MISSION	7
III. JUVENILE CASE PROCESSING	8
Intake	9
Informal Hearing Officer	16
Intake Highlights	17
Residential Pre-Dispositional Placements	18
Detention Highlights	22
Adjudication	22
Supervision	23
Supervision Highlights	25
Specialized Programs	26
Work Programs	29
Education Programs	29
Residential Services	31
IV. ADULT CASE PROCESSING	34
Domestic Relations Case Processing	34
Adult Criminal Case Processing	34
Adult Complaints Highlights	36
Support, Custody and Visitation Complaint Case Processing	37
Family Abuse	39
V. RESEARCH, INFORMATION AND TRAINING	40
Juvenile Court Grants	40
Findings from Research Studies and Reports	41
VI. COMMENTS ON THE DATA	42


FIGURES



Fig. No.		Page
1	Organizational Chart	1
2	Complaints, Budget and Personnel, FY 1999-FY 2002	4
3	Statistical Trends, FY 1983-FY 2002	5
4	Docketed Court Transactions, FY 1983-FY 2002	6
5	Vision, Mission and Values Statement	7
6	Simplified Case Flow	8
7	Sources of Juvenile Non-Traffic Complaints, FY 2002	9
8	Sources of Juvenile Non-Traffic Complaints, FY 1995-FY 2002	10
9	Juvenile Complaints Received by Race and Sex, FY 2002	11
10	Type of Juvenile Non-Traffic Complaint by Sex and Age, FY 2002	12
11	Juvenile Non-Traffic Complaint Race and Sex Distribution Trend, FY 1997-FY 2002	12
12	Juvenile Cases, Traffic and Non-Traffic FY 1997-FY 2002	13
13	Trends in Types of Juvenile Complaints, FY 1997-FY 2002	14
14	Percentage Distribution of Types of Juvenile Complaints Received, FY 1997-FY 2002, Excluding Traffic Cases	15
15	Intake Dispositions by Type of Juvenile Non-Traffic Offense, FY 1998- FY 2002	15
16	Hearing Officer Activity, FY 1988-FY 2002	16
17	Juveniles Confined by Place, Race, and Sex, FY 2002	19
18	Average Length of Stay by Age and Place, FY 2002	19
19	Secure Confinement Trends, FY 1997-FY 2002	19
20	Residential Placement Days, FY 1997-FY 2002	20
21	Average Length of Stay for Juveniles Released, FY 1997-FY 2002	20
22	Detention Placements by Complaint Type, FY 2002	21
23	Percentage Distribution of Offenses for which Youth were Detained, FY 2002	21
24	Commitments to State Department of Juvenile Justice from Fairfax County, FY 1991-FY 2002	23
25	Age and Sex of Juveniles Receiving Probation Services During FY 2002 (<i>By Court Units</i>)	24
26	Race and Sex of Juveniles Receiving Probation Services During FY 2002 (<i>By Court Units</i>)	24
27	Type of Juvenile Probation Services During FY 2002 (<i>By Court Units</i>)	25
28	Family Counseling and Substance Abuse Assessment Unit Statistics, FY 2002	32
29	Volunteer Services, FY 1996-FY 2002	32
30	Utilization and Costs of Residential Facilities, FY 2002	33
31	Caseloads of Programs and Residential Facilities, FY 1997-FY 2002	33
32	New Domestic Relations Cases, FY 2002	34
33	New Adult Complaints, FY 1999-2002	35
34	Adult Complaints, FY 1998-FY 2002	35
35	Domestic Relations Court Adult Probation, FY 2001 and FY 2002	36
36	Trends in Types of New Adult Complaints, FY 1999-FY 2002	37
37	Support Accounts and Amounts Collected for Support, Fines, Costs, and Restitution, FY 1989-FY 2002	38
38	Restitution, Fines and Costs Collected, FY 1992-FY 2002	39

FIGURE 1

FY 2002 JUVENILE AND DOMESTIC RELATIONS DISTRICT COURT





I. GENERAL OVERVIEW



The Fairfax County Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court is responsible for adjudicating juvenile matters, offenses committed by adults against juveniles, and family matters except divorce. The Court offers comprehensive services for delinquent youngsters under the legal age of 18 who live in Fairfax County, the City of Fairfax, and the towns of Herndon, Vienna, and Clifton. In addition, the Court provides services to adults in these jurisdictions who are experiencing domestic and/or familial difficulties that are amenable to unofficial arbitration, counseling, or legal intervention. The Court also provides services required in adult criminal complaints for offenses committed against juveniles unrelated to them.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Prior to 1956, all juvenile and domestic relations cases were heard by a County Court judge and all probation and investigation functions were handled by the County's Department of Public Welfare. In 1956, the County Board of Supervisors established a separate probation office for the Court with a Chief Probation Officer, three probation officers and two clerical staff. Court was in session one day a week with the Judge of the County Court presiding. In 1962, the Court expanded hearings to three days a week, with each County Court judge sitting for one day. In 1965, the first full-time Juvenile Court Judge was appointed and court met daily. By FY 1981, five full-time judges were hearing cases. In FY 1993, a sixth judge was approved by the state, and in FY 1994, a seventh judge was approved.

A major change in the Court's organization resulted from the Court Reorganization Act of 1973. As of July 1974, all judges and those clerical personnel who performed jobs directly related to judicial rather than probation functions became state employees and the responsibility of the Executive Secretary of the Supreme Court. A separate Clerk of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court was appointed in the fall of 1974. This position is responsible for supervising all state clerks. Court recorders became state employees in 1980. Court services remained a local responsibility. The Court Services Unit is one of three local court service units in the state.

County-funded Court staff were reorganized in FY 1980. Three divisions were established: Probation Services,

Residential Services, and Administrative Services. The Probation Services Division has four juvenile probation offices throughout the County. The Division also includes separate juvenile and domestic relations intake offices as well as a special services and a family counseling unit located in the courthouse. The Residential Services Division oversees the Juvenile Detention Center, the Less Secure Shelter, the Girls and Boys Probation Houses, and Supervised Release Services. Figure 1 shows the FY 2002 organizational chart for the Court.

The development of special programs to augment traditional probation services has been particularly important to the Court's development. Specialized programs include the Informal Hearing Officer Program, Community Services, Family Counseling, Diagnostic Team, the Volunteer Learning Program, School Probation Officer Program, Traffic School, the Maximize Attendance Program, the Less Secure Shelter, the Juvenile Detention Center, Supervised Release Services, two Probation Houses, and five alternative schools. Several of these programs were initially funded through Federal and state grant funds and were subsequently funded by the County.

The trend in Court and probation services clearly has been to provide a graduated sanctions continuum that delivers a range of correctional and treatment programs to its offender populations. It is anticipated that this trend will continue, with the Court significantly focusing in the coming years on strategic planning and on research to help determine which services are most appropriate for specific offenders.

BUDGET AND PERSONNEL

In FY 2002, expenditures for the Court Service Unit totaled \$16,853,955, a 4.8% increase from the year before. Personnel costs accounted for 85% of expenditures with operating costs making up the remaining 15% (Figure 2). During this fiscal year, the Court operated with 352 staff year equivalents. This total included 7 judges and 35 state clerks supported from state funds and 310 local Court Service Unit staff. An additional 20.5 positions were supported by grant and Title IV-E funds during FY 2002. The Court generated \$10,618,355 in non-County revenue in FY 2002. The majority of these funds represent state reimbursement for the operation of residential facilities.

FIGURE 2

COMPLAINTS, BUDGET AND PERSONNEL
FAIRFAX COUNTY JUVENILE AND
DOMESTIC RELATIONS DISTRICT COURT
FY 1999-FY 2002

	FY99		FY00		FY01		FY02	
	NO.	% ±	NO.	% ±	NO.	% ±	NO.	% ±
COMPLAINTS	31,847	7.0	30,968	-2.8	31,346*	1.2	20,896	-33.3
Juvenile	22,304	7.1	22,803	2.2	21,560	-5.5	12,320	-42.9
Adult	9,543	7.0	8,165	-14.4	9,786	19.9	8,576	-12.4
APPROVED FISCAL PLAN	\$13,423,699	3.2	\$14,306,470	6.6	\$16,069,265	12.3	\$17,295,035	7.6
ACTUAL EXPENDITURES	\$13,547,657	9.1	\$14,547,751	7.4	\$16,078,096	10.5	\$16,853,944	4.8
Personal Services	11,341,309	12.5	12,240,790	7.9	13,612,426	11.2	14,369,624	5.6
Operating Expenses	2,093,157	-5.6	2,258,540	7.9	2,444,578	8.2	2,447,737	0.1
Capital Equipment	113,191	-5.6	48,421	-57.2	21,092	-56.4	36,583	73.4
ACTUAL NON-COUNTY REVENUE	\$6,540,636	31.5	\$7,289,143	11.4	\$7,138,395	-2.1	\$10,618,355**	48.7
Federal – USDA	129,733	15.4	131,573	1.4	141,951	7.9	144,765	2.0
State – DJJ Reimbursement/VJCCCA	1,365,221	3.1	1,459,737	6.9	1,541,921	5.6	1,551,459	0.6
State – Residential	4,712,540	53.8	5,348,984	13.5	5,126,783	-4.2	8,605,010**	67.8
Local Fines/Penalties	145,228	-0.5	156,244	7.6	162,891	4.3	140,096	-14.0
Agency – User Fees	187,914	58.8	192,605	2.5	164,849	-14.4	177,025	7.4
STAFFING LEVELS (staff year equivalents)	336.0	7.5	344.0	2.4	352.0	2.3	352.0	0.0
State Positions – Judges	7.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	7.0	0.0
State Positions – Clerk Staff	35.0	34.6	35.0	0.0	35.0	0.0	35.0	0.0
LOCAL CSU POSITIONS	294.0	0.3	302.0	2.7	310.0	2.6	310.0	0.0
Professional Staff	249.0	2.9	249.0	0.0	259.0	4.0	259.0	0.0
Support Staff	45.0	-15.1	53.0	17.8	51.0	-3.8	51.0	0.0
GRANT POSITIONS	6.0	1.0	6.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	8.5	41.7
Grant Awards	\$254,286	52.6	\$412,903	62.4	\$378,654	-8.3	\$671,784	77.4
TITLE IV-E POSITIONS	—	—	—	—	—	—	12.0	0.0
Title IV-E Award	—	—	—	—	—	—	\$814,344	—

* The data for FY 2001 is based on new cases on the docket from the State Supreme Court.

**The Court received reimbursement funding in FY 2002 from the State for construction of the Juvenile Detention Center.

FIGURE 3

STATISTICAL TRENDS
FY 1983-FY 2002

FISCAL YEAR	TOTAL COUNTY POPULATION (a)	COUNTY JUVENILE POPULATION (b)	DELINQUENCY AND CHINS COMPLAINTS (c)	JUVENILE COMPLAINTS PER JUVENILE POPULATION	ADULT COMPLAINTS (d)	ADULT COMPLAINTS PER TOTAL POPULATION
1983	651,000	82,100	5,260	.064	3,731	.006
1984	660,500	81,100	5,227	.064	3,764	.006
1985	689,100	80,970	5,207	.064	4,675	.007
1986	699,900	81,830	5,800	.071	4,330	.006
1987	715,900	81,452	5,333	.066	4,260	.006
1988	739,200	78,882	5,805	.074	4,776	.006
1989	785,000	78,351	5,903	.075	4,573	.006
1990	832,346	77,580	6,010	.077	4,633	.006
1991	843,995	74,902	6,714	.090	5,262	.006
1992	862,700	78,754	7,569	.096	5,617	.007
1993	871,500	79,818	7,423	.093	6,490	.007
1994	885,900	81,298	8,209	.100	6,391	.007
1995	899,500	81,512	7,647	.094	6,643	.007
1996	911,700	82,764	8,254	.100	7,126	.007
1997	933,700	84,038	8,497	.101	5,425	.006
1998	948,800	93,766	7,567	.080	6,399	.007
1999	980,300	95,876	6,442	.067	6,728	.006
2000	991,249	100,780	6,417	.063	6,182	.006
2001	1,020,071	101,371	8,021*	.079	9,786*	.010
2002	1,037,333	101,473	5,744*	.057	8,576*	.009

* New cases are based on the Supreme Court Case Management System (CMS) Reports.

a. Includes Fairfax City. Source: Fairfax County Department of System Management for Human Services.

b. September public school membership, grades 5-12, including special education. Source: Fairfax County Public Schools.

c. Juvenile complaints excluding traffic, custody, rules, capiases, reviews, attorney appointments, pre-trial motions, record inspection requests, seeing intake counselors for information, and leaving without seeing intake counselor.

d. Adult complaints excluding rules, capiases, reviews, attorney appointments, pre-trial motions, seeing intake counselors for information, and leaving without seeing intake counselor.



FIGURE 4

DOCKETED COURT TRANSACTIONS FY 1983-FY 2002

FISCAL YEAR	COURT DAYS	NON-TRAFFIC TRANSACTIONS	DAILY AVERAGE	TRAFFIC TRANSACTIONS	DAILY AVERAGE	TOTAL TRANSACTIONS	DAILY AVERAGE
1983	243	22,377	92.1	9,591	39.5	31,968	131.6
1984	235	23,059	98.1	8,718	37.1	31,777	135.2
1985	235	24,609	104.7	9,460	40.3	34,069	145.0
1986	240	25,801	107.5	10,338	43.1	36,139	150.6
1987	239	24,172	101.1	13,205	55.3	37,377	156.4
1988	240	24,619	102.6	13,907	57.9	38,526	160.5
1989	239	25,205	105.5	13,705	57.3	38,910	162.8
1990	240	26,004	108.4	11,307	47.1	37,311	155.5
1991	248	28,539	115.1	11,151	45.0	39,690	160.0
1992	246	32,567	132.4	10,656	43.3	43,223	175.7
1993	229	35,953	145.0	8,852	35.7	44,805	180.7
1994	245	38,573	157.4	8,394	34.3	46,967	191.7
1995	247	43,251	175.1	8,888	36.0	52,139	211.1
1996	244	39,116	160.3	8,141	33.4	47,257	193.7
1997	245	41,813	170.7	8,663	35.4	50,476	206.0
1998	247	45,974	186.1	8,360	33.8	54,334	220.0
1999	246	49,838	202.6	8,347	33.9	58,185	236.5
2000	248	52,249	210.7	8,760	35.3	61,009	246.0
2001	248	51,823	209.0	9,713	39.2	61,536	248.1
2002	248	51,228	206.6	9,195	37.1	60,423	243.6

Note: The State Supreme Court Uniform Docketing System was begun in 1976 and hearings began to be counted uniformly throughout Virginia. Each complaint heard is counted as one hearing. Therefore, if five complaints are heard at one time, the Uniform Docketing System counts them as five hearings.

II. AGENCY MISSION



FIGURE 5

FAIRFAX COUNTY JUVENILE AND DOMESTIC RELATIONS COURT COURT SERVICES UNIT VISION, MISSION AND VALUES STATEMENT

VISION

To be a leader among the nation's juvenile and domestic relations courts, improving the lives of the youth, adults, and families we work with, enhancing public safety, in partnership with our community.

MISSION

To provide efficient and effective probation and residential services which promote positive behavior change for those children and adults who come within the Court's authority consistent with the well-being of the client, his/her family, and the protection of the community.

VALUES


- ★ We believe that we must conduct ourselves responsibly in order to demonstrate professionalism in dealing with each other and the community. We will hold ourselves accountable for our actions and for the expectations of the agency.
- ★ We understand the trust placed in us by the public and our colleagues is essential for the performance of our duties. We are committed to honest, lawful and ethical behavior.
- ★ We are committed to continuous education and training that enhances professional development. We believe a broad base of current knowledge will help meet our clients' needs and promote implementation of the highest quality services for the community.
- ★ We believe healthy relationships with colleagues and clients are critical for successful performance. We are dedicated to building well-functioning, empowering relationships.
- ★ We believe effective, open communication is essential to the cohesiveness and performance of our organization. We strive to promote clear and accurate exchange of information, while seeking out and valuing the opinions of others. We also recognize the need to maintain the confidentiality of our clients.
- ★ We strive to be fair and objective in all of our interactions. We seek to deliver the appropriate balance between the rehabilitative and authoritative functions of the agency.
- ★ We recognize that clients are often under stress when utilizing our services. We endeavor to perform our work with compassion and understanding.
- ★ We respect the diversity, values and opinions of our partners and the community we serve. We will do our utmost to ensure that our services respond to the diversity of our community and are delivered in an equitable and professional manner.

III. JUVENILE CASE PROCESSING



Juvenile cases that progress through the entire juvenile system undergo the following sequence of processing stages, as represented schematically in the simplified case flow given in Figure 6: intake, adjudication, social investigation, disposition, court supervision, commitment, and after-care supervision. Cases do not necessarily go through all stages.

FIGURE 6



INTAKE

Juveniles thought to have committed offenses which are under the purview of the Juvenile Court are brought into the judicial system either by a police officer witnessing or responding to an alleged criminal offense, or by citizens, families, or other agencies.


When the police are called to the scene of an offense alleged to have been committed by a juvenile, the police officer verifies that an offense has occurred and completes an investigative report. If the suspected violator has been apprehended during Court hours, the police officer may

bring the juvenile to the Intake section at either the courthouse, the North or South County Services offices, or the East County office. If the police do not wish to detain the juvenile, they may send the child home and come to Intake to file a petition. A parent or other adult bringing a complaint against a juvenile also files the complaint at one of these offices.

Figure 7 shows the sources of juvenile non-traffic complaints in FY 2002. The trends in sources and complaints for the past five years are given in Figure 8.

FIGURE 7

SOURCES OF JUVENILE NON-TRAFFIC COMPLAINTS, FY 2002



Although they accounted for 30.3% of the juvenile non-traffic complaints during FY 2002, the police were responsible for 93.6% of all complaints alleging drug offenses, 66.5% of all complaints alleging crimes against persons, 70.2% of all complaints alleging property

offenses, and 81.0% of all complaints alleging crimes against the public peace. Immediate family members brought 68.2% of all complaints involving custody issues.

FIGURE 8

SOURCES OF JUVENILE NON-TRAFFIC COMPLAINTS, FISCAL YEARS 1995-2002

SOURCE	FY 1995 %	FY 1996 %	FY 1997 %	FY 1998 %	FY 2000 %	FY 2002 %
Police	26.0	27.7	32.5	36.5	32.1	30.3
Immediate Family	25.0	25.6	24.6	26.4	36.1	35.3
DHD	5.6	5.8	6.1	6.8	0.0	0.0
Probation Counselors	7.1	7.0	6.7	6.4	.4	10.5
Private Business/Store Security	4.1	3.5	4.3	3.5	3.7	3.0
Citizens	2.8	2.6	2.8	2.8	2.0	11.5
Other Relative	4.1	3.8	3.4	4.1	4.4	0.0
School	2.2	1.5	1.9	1.5	2.4	3.4
Other Juvenile Court	1.4	1.2	1.2	1.5	1.2	.3
Other Public Agency	.7	.3	.5	.3	7.8	4.3
Self	1.6	1.3	.1	.3	.1	.5
Other/Not Recorded	19.3	19.7	15.9	9.9	9.8	.8
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* The data for Source of Complaint for FY 1999 and 2001 was unavailable due to changes in the court's data system.

After a complaint has been filed with an intake clerk, each complainant is interviewed by an intake counselor. Intake counselors review cases to determine whether the Court has jurisdiction and the charge meets Virginia Code requirements for the offense. The Intake Officer may not refuse petitions that allege:

- (a) controversy over a child's custody, visitation or support;
- (b) a violation of the support laws;
- (c) the right of either a child or his parents to treatment or services required by law; or
- (d) family abuse has occurred and a protective order has been sought.

When a child is alleged to be abused, neglected, in need of services, in need of supervision, or delinquent and the intake officer believes that probable cause does not exist, the authorization of a petition will not be in the best interest of the family or juvenile, or the matter may be effectively dealt with by some agency other than the court, authorization for filing a petition may be refused.

Should a request for a petition in a felony or Class 1 misdemeanor case be refused, the complainant may appeal to a magistrate who might issue a warrant for the child to appear in Juvenile Court.

The FY 2002 complaints received against juveniles by race and sex are given in Figure 9.

FIGURE 9

JUVENILE COMPLAINTS RECEIVED BY RACE AND SEX, FY 2002

	WM	NWM	WF	NWF	TOTAL
PROPERTY OFFENSES					
Petit Larceny	201	205	92	83	581
Vandalism	263	143	33	19	458
Grand Larceny	145	157	58	65	425
Breaking and Entering	139	94	7	9	249
Trespassing	125	79	25	16	245
Fraud	71	57	13	23	164
Auto Larceny	49	65	20	11	145
Arson	87	37	2	2	128
SUBTOTAL	1,080	837	250	228	2,395
% of Total Property Offenses	45.1%	35.0%	10.4%	9.5%	100.0%

PERSONS OFFENSES					
Assault	201	216	85	92	594
Aggravated Assault	52	60	6	7	125
Robbery	22	74	3	3	102
Sex Offense	24	37	1	0	62
Extortion	12	13	1	4	30
Kidnapping	4	8	1	2	15
Murder	0	3	0	0	3
SUBTOTAL	315	411	97	108	931
% of Total Persons Offenses	33.8%	44.2%	10.4%	11.6%	100.0%

OFFENSES AGAINST THE PUBLIC					
Weapons Offense	114	84	5	12	215
Disorderly Conduct	62	71	14	29	176
Obstruction of Justice	12	16	8	11	47
Abusive and Insulting Language	11	5	7	9	32
Telephone	18	4	5	2	29
Other	14	14	6	0	34
SUBTOTAL	231	194	45	63	533
% of Total Public Offenses	43.3%	36.4%	8.4%	11.8%	100.0%

DRUG AND ALCOHOL OFFENSES					
Marijuana Possession	219	99	55	17	390
Purchase Alcohol	106	42	43	8	199
Drug Distribution	28	22	5	2	57
Drunk in Public	14	18	5	2	39
Distributing at School	10	9	1	1	21
Driving While Intoxicated	10	5	1	0	16
Other Drug	19	10	7	1	37
SUBTOTAL	406	205	117	31	759
% of Total Drug and Alcohol Offenses	53.5%	27.0%	15.4%	4.1%	100.0%

	WM	NWM	WF	NWF	TOTAL
STATUS/CHINS OFFENSES					
Truancy	72	108	53	95	328
Status Offenses/ CHINS Supervision	75	77	44	35	231
Runaway	31	49	66	80	226
Buy Tobacco	38	25	11	3	77
SUBTOTAL	216	259	174	213	862
% of Total CHINS Offenses	25.1%	30.0%	20.2%	24.7%	100.0%

CUSTODY OFFENSES					
Custody	344	970	350	989	2,653
Visitation	272	721	300	697	1,990
Abuse and Neglect	30	82	30	98	240
Foster Care	26	48	18	77	169
SUBTOTAL	672	1,821	698	1,861	5,052
% of Total Custody Offenses	13.3%	36.0%	13.8%	36.8%	100.0%

OTHER OFFENSES					
Parole, Probation, and Supervision Violations	252	263	126	167	808
Contempt of Court	79	119	63	75	336
Psychiatric Inpatient Treatment	26	12	18	9	65
Failure to Appear	6	12	4	7	29
Miscellaneous Crime Juvenile & Domestic Court Other	130	64	45	32	271
SUBTOTAL	604	561	297	326	1,788
% of Total Other Offenses	33.8%	31.4%	16.6%	18.2%	100.0%

TOTAL COMPLAINTS	3,524	4,288	1,678	2,830	12,320
% of Total Complaints	28.6%	34.8%	13.6%	23.0%	100.0

WM White Males
NWM... Non-White Males
WF White Females
NWF ... Non-White Females

Figure 10 gives the distribution of general complaint categories by age and sex for FY 2002. As it is possible for a single juvenile to be the subject of several different complaints, the number of complaints reported differs

from the number of alleged offenders. In FY 2002, 6,733 different juveniles had at least one non-traffic complaint. The average number of complaints per alleged offender in FY 2002 was 1.8 percent.

FIGURE 10

TYPE OF JUVENILE NON-TRAFFIC COMPLAINT BY SEX AND AGE, FY 2002

OFFENSE TYPE	MALE							FEMALE						
	<i>Less Than</i>						<i>Over</i>	<i>Less Than</i>						<i>Over</i>
	13	13	14	15	16	17	17	13	13	14	15	16	17	17
Offense Against Property	83	87	198	352	358	547	289	3	11	63	100	122	100	77
Offense Against Persons	34	54	72	130	115	166	138	12	7	23	48	50	47	18
Offense Against the Public and Morality	14	31	59	88	81	121	80	4	6	20	29	27	21	8
Status	13	24	49	75	116	153	45	7	10	43	71	113	120	22
Drug and Liquor	0	5	27	59	115	200	173	1	1	6	14	39	40	39
Custody	2,040	105	77	70	98	79	23	2,050	112	108	95	83	84	27
Other	28	29	69	166	250	370	387	8	11	48	137	200	141	104
Subtotal	2,212	335	551	940	1,133	1,636	1,135	2,085	158	311	494	634	553	295
Subtotal by Sex	Males: 7,942 (63.7%)							Females: 4,530 (36.3%)						
GRAND TOTAL	12,472													

* The total number of complaints displayed in this table is different from Table 9 because the data was derived from JUVARE rather than JTS.

Figure 11 shows the changing distribution of juvenile complaints by race and sex since FY 1997. Overall, during this period, the percentage of complaints brought

against white males and females decreased while complaints against non-white males and non-white females have increased.

FIGURE 11

JUVENILE NON-TRAFFIC COMPLAINT* RACE AND SEX DISTRIBUTION TREND FY 1997-FY 2002

	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001*	FY 2002
White Male	34.5%	33.3%	31.3%	30.9%		28.6%
White Female	16.5%	16.0%	16.5%	16.5%		13.6%
Non-White Male	32.1%	32.1%	31.6%	31.9%		34.8%
Non-White Female	16.9%	18.6%	20.6%	20.7%		23.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%
n	15,065	16,239	16,898	15,992		12,320

* The data for FY 2001 is unavailable due to changes in the court's management information system.

Figure 12 shows the change in juvenile complaints, both traffic and non-traffic, from FY, 1997 thru FY 2002.

FIGURE 12





Figure 13 graphs the changes in the categories of juvenile complaints since FY 1997.

FIGURE 13

TRENDS IN TYPES OF JUVENILE COMPLAINTS FY 1997-FY 2002



*Data by type of complaint for FY01 is unavailable due to changes in the court's management information system.

Figure 14 displays the changing distribution of juvenile complaints by offense type since FY 1997. The

chart refers to all juvenile complaints excluding traffic complaints.

FIGURE 14

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF TYPES OF JUVENILE COMPLAINTS* RECEIVED 1997-2002, EXCLUDING TRAFFIC CASES

	FY 1997 N=15,065	FY 1998 N=16,239	FY 1999 N=16,898	FY 2000 N=15,992	FY 2001	FY 2002 N=12,320
Offenses Against Property	23.8%	22.4%	15.8%	15.9%		19.4%
Offenses Against Persons	6.2%	6.5%	5.6%	6.0%		7.6%
Offenses Against Public	3.7%	3.5%	3.1%	2.3%		4.3%
Drug and Alcohol Offenses	6.8%	6.3%	5.7%	6.8%		6.2%
Status Offenses	9.2%	8.0%	8.0%	9.2%		7.0%
Custody and Neglect	32.1%	34.6%	43.4%	42.7%		41.0%
Other	18.2%	18.8%	18.4%	17.2%		14.5%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* Data by type of complaint for 2001 is unavailable due to changes in the court's management information system.

In FY 2002 court staff received 12,320 intakes on juvenile non-traffic complaints. Some intakes involve more than one complaint; there was an average of 1.5 complaints per juvenile non-traffic intake in FY 2002, almost the

same as last year. In FY 2002, Intake set for Court 87.5% of all juvenile non-traffic, non administrative complaints.

Figure 15 shows percentages of complaints set for court by Intake, by offense type, for FY 1998 through FY 2002.

FIGURE 15

INTAKE DISPOSITIONS BY TYPE OF JUVENILE NON-TRAFFIC OFFENSE, FY 1998-FY 2002

OFFENSE TYPE	FY 1998		FY 1999		FY 2000		FY 2002	
	No. of Complaints	Percent Set For Court	No. of Complaints	Percent Set For Court	No. of Complaints	Percent Set For Court	No. of Complaints	Percent Set For Court
Offense Against Property	3,659	83.9	2,685	80.8	2,538	78.4	2,398	80.6
Offense Against Persons	1,166	84.9	947	82.9	959	83.4	893	85.1
Offense Against the Public	422	90.8	518	85.1	365	86.6	609	89.8
Drug and Alcohol	1,016	93.5	961	94.6	1,092	94.2	704	89.6
Status	1,293	69.7	1,348	67.8	1,464	74.0	774	55.0
Custody	5,627	84.0	7,365	94.6	6,836	93.1	7,312	93.7
TOTAL	13,183	83.6	13,824	88.2	13,254	86.8	12,690	84.6

*Data by type of complaint for 2001 is unavailable due to changes in the court's management information system.

INFORMAL HEARING OFFICER

Juvenile Intake Services includes the Hearing Officer program which was developed in 1970 to hear minor misdemeanor cases that may be resolved by informal arbitration and sanctions. The Hearing Officer is used most frequently in trespassing, minor property, petty theft, and alcohol cases where the juvenile acknowledges his/her involvement in the offense.

The Hearing Officer states the nature of the hearing to the juvenile, the parents and/or complainants, and

discusses the situation with all involved. Depending on the problem and the nature of the responses, the Hearing Officer decides on the course of action. Most often, community service or restitution is assigned, or the case is continued for a period of time and closed if the juvenile commits no further offenses. A petition may be filed for formal processing if new offenses are committed.

Figure 16 shows that 402 informal hearings were held in FY 2002.

FIGURE 16

HEARING OFFICER ACTIVITY, FY 1988-2002

FISCAL YEAR	NUMBER OF HEARINGS	FISCAL YEAR	NUMBER OF HEARINGS
1988	451	1996	693
1989	554	1997	816
1990	506	1998	564
1991	684	1999	431
1992	777	2000	478
1993	771	2001	442
1994	714	2002	402
1995	812		



JUVENILE INTAKE



SUMMARY OF FY 2002 HIGHLIGHTS

- ★ The overall volume of complaints decreased by 23 percent during FY 2002. The Juvenile Court received 12,320 juvenile complaints in FY 2002, compared to 15,992 complaints received in FY 2000. It should be noted however, that during this time period the Court began to use the Juvenile Tracking System (JTS) case management system that was created by the Department of Juvenile Justice to collect complaint data. Intake complaints dropped significantly due to this switch because JTS does not capture the same intake activity as the Court's previous case management system.
- ★ Non-contested custody and neglect complaints composed the largest (41.0 percent) of non-traffic juvenile complaints. Property offenses continued to be the most common criminal offense among juveniles (19.4 percent of non-traffic complaints), followed by offenses against persons (7.6 percent), drug and alcohol offenses (6.2 percent), and offenses against the public (4.3 percent). Status offenses represent 7.0 percent of non-traffic juvenile complaints. "Other" types of complaints, such as probation and parole violations, motions, etc., represent 14.5 percent of total juvenile non-traffic complaints.
- ★ The largest decrease in delinquency complaints was in drug and alcohol offense complaints, which decreased 30.5 percent from 1,092 in FY 2000 to 759 in FY 2002.
- ★ Offenses against persons complaints did not change remarkably. There were 959 offenses against persons complaints in FY 2000 and 931 in FY 2002. The two most common complaints involved assault and aggravated assault.
- ★ The number of property offense complaints decreased slightly. There were 2,537 complaints in FY 2000 and 2,395 in FY 2002, a decrease of 5.6 percent.
- ★ "Other" types of complaints, which include violations of probation or parole, capiases, and seeing an intake counselor for information, decreased by 34.9 percent, from 2,748 in FY 2000 to 1,788 in FY 2002. This drop is due mainly to the switch to the JTS reporting system.
- ★ There was a 26 percent decrease in custody complaints, from 6,827 in FY 2000 to 5,052 in FY 2002.
- ★ There was a 9.0 percent decrease in the number of hearings held by the Informal Hearing Officer, from 442 in FY 2001 to 402 in FY 2002.
- ★ The total number of delinquency and status complaints decreased by 14.6 percent between FY 2000 and FY 2002, from 6,417 in FY 2000, to 5,480 in FY 2002.
- ★ About 30.3 percent of all youth are brought to Court by the police and another 35.3 percent are brought by someone in their immediate family.
- ★ The average age of a youth brought to court for delinquency or status offenses is 16 years.

RESIDENTIAL PRE-DISPOSITIONAL PLACEMENTS

In more serious cases that are not informally diverted, the intake counselor must decide whether the youth should be detained or placed outside of their home prior to a court hearing or whether they can be released to parents or a guardian. If holding is necessary, the Fairfax County Juvenile Court operates two pre-dispositional placement facilities for juveniles — the Less Secure Shelter and the Juvenile Detention Center.

The decision by Intake to hold youth outside of their homes is made because the youth may present a danger to the community or to themselves, and the judge may decide to detain if it is determined that the youth is unlikely to appear for the court hearing. In all cases in which children are placed outside their homes pending a hearing, a judicial determination to continue detention must be made by a judge the next working day after a youth is first detained to ensure that continued detention is appropriate. As of FY 1985, the Code of Virginia prohibited the detention of CHINS offenders in secure facilities except out-of-state runaway youth. However, revisions to the Code on July 1, 1989 allow for the secure detention of CHINS offenders who are in violation of a court order.

LESS SECURE SHELTER — The Less Secure Shelter is a pre-dispositional nonsecure, residential facility for juveniles. Most of the youths held in this facility are children in need of services and supervision. However, some placements are for delinquent offenders. The Less Secure Shelter opened on January 28, 1980, funded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) federal grant. In December, 1991 it moved into a facility adjacent to the new Juvenile Detention Center. This program was revised in FY 1991 to provide an intermediate 90-day treatment program for those youth who did not require a year-long residential program. Due to overcrowding at the facility, the intermediate program was suspended in 2001. Teachers from Fairfax County Public Schools provide a year-round academic curriculum.

JUVENILE DETENTION CENTER — The Juvenile Detention Center (JDC) is a secure pre- and post-dispositional, 121-bed holding facility that houses both male and female residents. It originally opened in 1982 with a capacity for 33 residents, it was expanded to 55 beds in October 1992, and then was increased in 1998 to its current capacity of 121 beds. The facility is designed both architecturally and programmatically to reduce stress for the residents while providing control and safety. Security is maintained primarily through physical

surveillance and personal contact between staff and residents in conjunction with electronic equipment. The extensive use of internal windows facilitates surveillance without obtrusiveness. Glass-lined corridors border two open inner courtyards that are surrounded by small group living areas. Each living area includes eleven bedrooms that open into a common dayroom that replaces the traditional cellblock. The building also provides specialized single-purpose space for schooling, art therapy and crafts, physical exercise in the form of a gym, a dining hall, an area for intakes and visiting, a medical office and exam room that is staffed by two full-time nurses and a part-time attending physician, and a reception and administrative area. Special attention is given to screening the medical and mental health needs of the residents and providing a balanced, low-sugar diet. The addition of a licensed psychologist and a mental health therapist in September 2002 has helped facilitate the management of residents with mental health concerns. In 1998, JDC established two 12-bed, post-dispositional units where residents are sentenced for as long as six months. Residents assigned to these units are provided mental health and alcohol and drug services through a grant acquired by the local Community Service Board (CSB). Individual, group, and family counseling are also a part of the post-dispositional program. The Juvenile Detention Center has received numerous facility and employee awards for outstanding performance.

SUPERVISED RELEASE SERVICES — Supervised Release Services (SRS) encompasses the Outreach Detention and Electronic Monitoring Programs. It provides highly structured supervision, monitoring, and services to juveniles who are awaiting adjudication or final disposition of charges, and might otherwise be detained at the Juvenile Detention Center or placed at the Less Secure Shelter. Judges may release juveniles to SRS at a detention hearing, or an adjudication or dispositional hearing, on the condition that they follow the rules established by the Court in conjunction with the SRS program. SRS staff meets with the assigned juveniles immediately after their release to SRS, or within 24 hours, to establish SRS rules as required by State minimum standards. Staff also orient juveniles and parents to other expectations, such as frequency and place of visits, and sanctions for rule violations. SRS staff visits juveniles four times per week, which include at least once every other day, weekdays, and weekends. Visits take place at a juvenile's home, place of employment, or school. Staff contact parents or guardians at least weekly.

Figures 17, 18 and 19 show numbers and lengths of juvenile stays in these various placements in FY 2002, as well as secure confinement trends since 1997. Figures 17 through 21 are based on juveniles released from placement during FY 2002.

These figures report numbers of stays, which exceed

the number of juveniles confined since a single juvenile may be confined more than once in the same year. In FY 2002, 1,014 different juveniles were confined to a juvenile detention home (all at the Fairfax Juvenile Detention Center). During the previous fiscal year, a total of 1,076 different juveniles were held in juvenile detention.

FIGURE 17

JUVENILES CONFINED IN SECURE DETENTION AND DETENTION ALTERNATIVES BY PLACE, RACE, AND SEX, FY 2002

RACE AND SEX	FAIRFAX COUNTY JUVENILE DETENTION CENTER			SUPERVISED RELEASE SERVICES		
	Placements	No. Days	ALS*	Placements	No. Days	ALS*
White Male	465	7,412	15.9	222	7,780	35.0
White Female	183	2,628	14.4	128	5,138	40.1
Non-White Male	517	12,576	24.3	206	6,749	32.8
Non-White Female	200	2,804	14.0	142	4,190	29.5
TOTAL	1,365	25,420	18.6	698	23,857	34.2
	LESS SECURE SHELTER					
	Placements	No. Days	ALS*			
White Male	67	838	12.5			
White Female	119	1,150	9.7			
Non-White Male	98	919	9.4			
Non-White Female	131	1,172	8.9			
TOTAL	415	4,079	9.8			

*ALS = Average length of stay.

FIGURE 18

AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY (DAYS) BY AGE AND PLACE, FY 2002

AGE	FAIRFAX COUNTY JUVENILE DETENTION CENTER	SUPERVISED RELEASE SERVICES	LESS SECURE SHELTER
10 or under	6.5	46.0	20.0
11	—	87.2	—
12	11.3	36.0	—
13	15.2	38.5	11.0
14	19.0	36.7	9.8
15	17.4	29.4	8.7
16	17.8	35.7	8.2
17+	20.1	33.8	12.1

FIGURE 19

SECURE CONFINEMENT TRENDS, FY 1997-FY 2002

FAIRFAX JUVENILE DETENTION CENTER*	FY 1997*	FY 1998*	FY 1999*	FY 2000*	FY 2001**	FY 2002**
Number Released	1,509	1,651	1,430	1,475	1,344	1,365
Child Care Days	31,166	29,717	36,222	31,493	24,339	25,420
Average Length of Stay	20.7	18.0	25.3	21.3	18.1	18.6

*Includes both predispositional and sentencing programs.
** Predispositional only.

Figure 20 shows the changes in the number of days spent in detention or detention alternatives between FY

1997 and FY 2002. Figure 21 plots changes over the past six years in the average length of stay in various placements.

FIGURE 20




FIGURE 21




FIGURE 22

DETENTION PLACEMENTS BY COMPLAINT TYPE, FY 2002

OFFENSE TYPE	TOTAL COMPLAINTS	% OF TOTAL
PROPERTY OFFENSES		
Larceny	186	34.5%
Vandalism	99	18.4%
Auto Larceny	90	16.7%
Breaking and Entering	56	10.4%
Fraud	44	8.2%
Trespassing	37	6.9%
Arson	27	5.0%
TOTAL	539	100.0%

OFFENSES AGAINST PERSONS		
Assault	310	70.1%
Robbery	80	18.1%
Sex Offenses	25	5.7%
Kidnapping	14	3.2%
Extortion	10	2.3%
Murder	3	0.6%
TOTAL	442	100.0%

OFFENSES AGAINST THE PUBLIC		
Weapons Offenses	97	51.9%
Disorderly Conduct	28	15.0%
Abusive Language	10	5.3%
Telephone	5	2.7%
Other	47	25.1%
TOTAL	187	100.0%

OFFENSE TYPE	TOTAL COMPLAINTS	% OF TOTAL
DRUG AND ALCOHOL OFFENSES		
Purchase Alcohol	40	42.6%
Drug Distribution	23	24.5%
Drunk in Public	3	3.2%
Driving While Intoxicated	3	3.2%
Other Drug Offenses	25	26.6%
TOTAL	94	100.0%


OTHER OFFENSES		
Parole/Probation Violations	351	70.8%
Contempt of Court	91	18.3%
Failure To Appear	14	2.8%
Other Offenses	40	8.1%
TOTAL	496	100.0%

TOTAL OFFENSES	1,758	100.0%
-----------------------	--------------	---------------

*Youth may have been placed in detention for more than one offense.

FIGURE 23

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF OFFENSES FOR WHICH YOUTH WERE DETAINED FY 2002



DETENTION



SUMMARY OF FY 2002 HIGHLIGHTS

- ★ Total stays in secure confinement decreased 7.5 percent over the last two years from 1,475 in FY 2000 to 1,365 in FY 2002.
- ★ The majority of juveniles held in the Fairfax County Juvenile Detention Center were detained for property offenses (30.7 percent), followed by offenses against persons (25.1 percent), while 20.0 percent were held for probation/parole violations. A little over 10.0 percent of youth were detained for offenses against the public and 5.3 percent were held for drug and alcohol offenses. Over one-fourth (28.2 percent) of youth were detained for “Other” offenses (see Figure 23 for a detailed listing of offenses).
- ★ There was a decrease in the utilization rate at the Fairfax County Juvenile Detention Center, from 102.3 percent of capacity in FY 2000 to 74.3 percent of capacity in FY 2002.
- ★ The average length of stay at the JDC decreased from 21 days to in FY 2000 to 18 days in FY 2002.
- ★ The utilization rate of the Less Secure Shelter decreased from 105.3 percent in FY 2000 to 92.6 percent in FY 2002 (see Figure 31).
- ★ The Supervised Release Service Program is composed of the Electronic Monitoring Program and the Outreach Detention Program. Utilization in the program increased from 117.4 percent in FY 2000 to 137.6 percent in FY 2002.

ADJUDICATION

If children are confined in a juvenile detention home, Less Secure or Adult Detention Center, their hearings are scheduled within 21 days of the detention hearing. Otherwise, the adjudicatory hearing is generally set by Intake three to four weeks after the filing of the complaint.

If the offense is one for which a child may lose his or her freedom, an attorney is provided by the Court or the juvenile is required to retain one, depending on the

family’s financial situation. At the hearing, the juvenile is informed by the judge of the alleged offense and is asked for a plea of innocent or guilty. The complainant explains the circumstance which led to the filing of the petition, the accused juvenile may respond to the charges, and any other witnesses are called. The judge then decides the disposition of the case. Options available to the judge at this point include, but are not limited to:

- ★ commitment to the State Department of Juvenile Justice,
- ★ placement in a Court Probation House,
- ★ award of custody of the child to the Court for special placement in a certified residential institution,
- ★ placement of the child under Court supervision,
- ★ continuance for a social investigation to be conducted
- by a probation counselor to bring recommendations on appropriate dispositions to the judge at a later date,
- ★ fine and costs or restitution,
- ★ continuation of the case to be dismissed at a future date if there are no further offenses, or
- ★ dismissal of the charge.

Figure 24 reports the number of commitments to the State Department of Juvenile Justice since FY 1991.

FIGURE 24

COMMITMENTS TO STATE DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE JUSTICE FROM FAIRFAX COUNTY, FY 1991-2002	
FISCALYEAR	NUMBER OF COMMITMENTS
1991	74
1992	97
1993	92
1994	86
1995	107
1996	125
1997	103
1998	105
1999	93
2000	60*
2001	51
2002	45

*The large drop in commitments in FY 2000 was due to the implementation of the Intensive Supervision Program.

SUPERVISION

If juveniles are placed under Court supervision, they are assigned a probation counselor in their area of the county. Rules for probation are prepared, signed by the judge, the juvenile, the juvenile's parents and the probation counselor and are given to the youth. Figures 25, 26, and 27 show the race, sex, and ages by court center of juveniles under different types of supervision during FY 2002.

Some juveniles come under several different types of supervision during the same year. For example, first they have a social investigation, then are put on probation, and then may be on parole. The number of supervisions reported above, therefore, exceeds the number of different juveniles under some form of supervision. The total number of juveniles under supervision was 2,179 in FY 2002, compared with 2,225 in FY 2000, 2,598 in FY 1999, 2,386 in FY 1998, and 2,283 in FY 1997.

FIGURE 25

**AGE AND SEX OF JUVENILES RECEIVING
PROBATION SERVICES DURING FY 2002
(By Court Units)**

MALE							
AGE	CENTER	NORTH	SOUTH	EAST	SPECIAL SERVICES	TOTAL NO.	PERCENT
Under 13	17	17	30	3	0	67	2.7
13	36	26	20	11	3	96	3.8
14	61	68	61	22	9	221	8.8
15	121	79	122	37	26	385	15.4
16	152	131	180	43	53	559	22.3
17 and over	379	251	245	96	203	1,174	46.9
Sub Total	766	572	658	212	294	2,502	100.0
FEMALE							
AGE	CENTER	NORTH	SOUTH	EAST	SPECIAL SERVICES	TOTAL NO.	PERCENT
Under 13	5	4	3	2	0	14	1.4
13	6	18	7	4	0	35	3.6
14	36	17	20	15	3	91	9.3
15	48	70	59	17	3	197	20.2
16	83	81	81	21	7	273	28.0
17 and over	136	91	89	34	15	365	37.4
Sub Total	314	281	259	93	28	975	100.0
GRAND TOTAL	1,080	853	917	305	322	3,477	

FIGURE 26

**RACE AND SEX OF JUVENILES RECEIVING
PROBATION SERVICES DURING FY 2002**

	CENTER*		NORTH		SOUTH		EAST COUNTY		SPECIAL SERVICES		TOTAL	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
White Male	410	38.0	345	40.4	306	33.4	110	36.1	115	35.7	1,286	37.0
White Female	156	14.4	142	16.6	117	12.8	45	14.8	16	5.0	476	13.7
Non-White Male	357	33.1	227	26.6	352	38.4	102	33.4	179	55.6	1,217	35.0
Non-White Female	157	14.5	139	16.3	142	15.5	48	15.7	12	3.7	498	14.3
TOTAL	1,080	100.0	853	100.0	917	100.0	305	100.0	322	100.0	3,477	100.0
% of Total	31.1%		24.5%		26.4%		8.8%		9.3%		100%	
*Includes MAP program cases												

FIGURE 27

**TYPE OF JUVENILE PROBATION SERVICES DURING FY 2002
(By Court Units)**

	CENTER	NORTH	SOUTH	EAST COUNTY	SPECIAL SERVICES	TOTAL	PERCENT TOTAL
Probation	403	372	409	125	128	1,437	41.3
I & R	349	369	326	118	8	1,170	33.6
Pre-dispo. Supervision	287	67	105	39	7	505	14.5
Committed Offender	—	—	—	—	65	65	1.9
Courtesy Supervision	18	18	48	10	2	96	2.8
Parole	—	—	—	—	95	95	2.7
Inactive Probation	23	27	29	13	17	109	3.1
TOTAL	1,080	853	917	305	322	3,477	100.0%
% of Total	31.1%	24.5%	26.4%	8.8%	9.3%	100.0%	100.0%

JUVENILE SUPERVISION



SUMMARY OF HIGHLIGHTS

- ★ The total number of juvenile supervision services increased 3.1 percent, from 3,371 in FY 2000 to 3,477 in FY 2002.
- ★ The proportion of supervision services by unit was distributed as follows:
 - Center County 31.1 percent
 - South County 26.4 percent
 - North County 24.5 percent
 - East County 8.8 percent
 - Special Services 9.3 percent
- ★ The total number of individual youth under supervision in FY 2002 was 2,179, down 2.1 percent from FY 2000 when 2,225 youths were under supervision.
- ★ Almost a quarter (72.0 percent) of the youth supervised were male, 28.0 percent were female (see Figure 25).
- ★ Almost half (44.3 percent) of all youth under supervision were 17 years old and over; while 23.9 percent of all youth under supervision were 16 years of age.

COURT PROGRAMS



SPECIALIZED PROGRAMS

The effective reduction of future offenses by juveniles brought to its attention is of critical importance to the Court. Consequently, many specialized services have been developed to enhance court intervention. In FY 2002 these included diagnostic services; work, education, and family counseling programs; coordination of volunteer activity; direct court placement; and restitution.

PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES — Judges may order psychological evaluations, usually as part of social investigations, for juveniles within the purview of the Court. Probation counselors also may request such evaluations during the course of social investigations to aid in the formulation of treatment plans. Although private doctors and psychologists perform some of these evaluations, emergency cases are performed by staff psychologists from the Community Services Board assigned to the Court. The Court has used psychological support services since the fall of 1970; it contracts with a private service provider for all other needed evaluations.

DIAGNOSTIC TEAM — Coordinated by a probation counselor assigned to the Special Services Unit, the Diagnostic Team is an interagency group whose membership includes a psychologist assigned to the Court, a family counselor from the Court staff, and, according to the particular case under consideration, representatives from the Health Department, the Department of Family Services (DFS), the Fairfax County Public Schools, Alcohol and Drug Services, and other agencies. The group reviews especially difficult cases referred by judges or probation counselors, and reports its recommendations to the judges. DFS counselors occasionally refer cases of Court-involved juveniles. Most juveniles whose cases come before the team have failed to respond to prior treatment efforts. The team considers a range of specialized diagnostic evaluations about each juvenile it sees, and facilitates collaboration among the different agencies whose cooperation is required to implement recommended treatment plans. Special emphasis is placed on checking whether community resources have been exhausted before recommending the removal of any juvenile from the community. The team has operated since 1974.

FAMILY SYSTEMS COUNSELING AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE ASSESSMENT UNIT

— The Family Systems Counseling Program, developed in 1970, provides ongoing family counseling services to families involved with the Court. The counseling is designed to assist families who are experiencing problems with a child's behavior, custody visitation, or support matters, or marital difficulties. The goal of the program is to aid family members in understanding the development and maintenance of the problems in order to develop more thoughtful and effective problem-solving methods. Referrals to the program are made by Court service staff and judges. One eight-hour seminar is offered about five times a year: The Impact of Separation and Divorce on Families Seminar and Conflict Resolution Seminar. The program also prepares evaluations for the Court's Interdisciplinary and Diagnostic Team and offers training and consultation to other Court staff. This unit also provides substance abuse screening, evaluations, education groups and substance abuse counseling by certified substance abuse counselors.

VICTIM SERVICES — The State of Virginia enacted the Virginia Crime Victim and Witness Rights Act (19.2-11.0 Code of Virginia) circa 1995 to address the needs of victims. In response, the Victim Services Program was developed to aid victims who have been victimized by juvenile offenders. Victim referral forms are completed by the complainant during the intake process and are forwarded to Victim Services by the Juvenile Intake staff. The victim, adult or juvenile, is contacted and afforded the choice to actively participate, with appropriate assistance, in all stages of the criminal justice process. Services provided to the victim include but are not limited to emotional support, advanced notice of court proceedings, preparing the victim for court, home visits, assistance in writing Victim Impact Statements and filing Restitution Claim Forms, arrangement of victim/offender meetings, resource referrals for counseling, medical or psychological services, assistance in obtaining compensation through the Criminal Injuries Compensation Fund and notification of offender status. Victim services staff advocate on behalf of the victim to the Commonwealth's Attorney, in cooperation with probation staff, to insure their rights to participate in an offender's sentencing and to have

knowledge of any plea bargain being offered to the court. In addition, probation staff may call upon Victim Services to obtain information from the victim when preparing an Investigation and Report for the court or to request a probation meeting, with a probationer, for the purpose of victim impact education.

JUVENILE TRAFFIC SCHOOL — The Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court offers a program of driver improvement for youth who have been cited and come to court due to a traffic law infraction. This program, The Youth /Parent Perceptive Driving Seminar, requires that a parent or legal guardian attend and participate with the youth. The course utilizes the parent's experience in helping their son or daughter to correct and improve any driving behaviors which could lead to other infractions or possible traffic accidents. The parents are also provided with "tools" which aid them in assessing what further skill development is needed on the part of their youth.

The Youth/Parent Perceptive Driving Seminar involves nine hours of classroom time and at least five hours of driving practice outside of class with the parent at home. Youth who successfully complete the seminar will receive a Certificate of Completion and may have their citations dropped or charges reduced by the court.

Effective July 1, 1998 any youth, under the age of 18 is required to attend a driver improvement program if they are convicted of a traffic law violation. Youth under the age of 18 are no longer permitted to receive safe driving points. The parent attending with his/her son or daughter can receive safe driving point credit or have participation noted on their driving record for insurance premium reduction purposes.

VOLUNTEER SERVICES — Volunteers from Fairfax County and the region participate in the delivery of court services in numerous ways. They assist as court aides, restitution aides, courtroom assistants, court companions for victims of domestic violence, community service supervisors, and interpreters for the court and special activities leaders. Students from regional universities earn college credits through the court by assisting with probation and parole, in the Family Systems Counseling Unit, in Domestic Relations Services, and other programs. The volunteer services coordinator recruits and screens the volunteers and interns, works with the training coordinator to orient them to the court system, and places them with the staff members they will be assisting. The coordinator acts as a liaison between the court and the local colleges, community organizations, the Volunteer Center for Fairfax County, and concerned citizens.

VOLUNTEER INTERPRETER PROGRAM — Created through the efforts of the Fairfax Bar Association and the Juvenile Court, the Volunteer Interpreter Program (VIP) assists staff working with individuals for whom English is a barrier. This helps clients and visitors to access appropriate court services as well as court staff to more effectively process clients. The program currently provides Spanish language interpretation, and some other languages are available upon request (Portuguese, French, Italian and Korean). Volunteer interpreters are available for all units and facilities. However, courtroom service is limited to civil status hearings. Interpretation services consist of face-to-face interpretations between staff and clients as well as telephone interpretations. Translation services for written documents are also available. The Language Access Coordinator coordinates the program.

COURT COMPANION PROGRAM — As a service of the Domestic Relations Unit, volunteer Court Companions are available to assist victims of domestic violence. A magistrate or an intake worker of the Domestic Relations Unit may arrange for a Court Companion if a family abuse warrant or a preliminary protective order has been issued. The client is called in order to determine eligibility, that is, whether or not the client has legal counsel or any support service (such as from a shelter or the Victim Witness Program). Arrangements are made for the Court Companion to meet the client before the hearing. Once there, the Court Companion provides information about the courtroom setting and process; reviews important details of the petition with the client and helps the client focus on his/her desired outcomes. The Court Companion sits behind the client during the hearing and afterward escorts the client to Room 1300 to read and understand the order as issued. The Language Access Coordinator coordinates the program.

SPECIAL PLACEMENTS/SERVICES — In July 1993, in accordance with the implementation of the Comprehensive Services Act (CSA), funds for the purchase of residential placements and for non-residential services for Court youths were transferred from the State level to the local government level. Five Family Assessment and Planning Teams review the need for services and are responsible for ensuring that existing local resources have been utilized prior to approval of out-of-home placements. When a placement is approved, the team's emphasis is on selecting the least restrictive placement while still meeting the needs of the youth. The Court's two placement coordinators assume casework responsibilities for placements and provide probation/parole supervision to those youths. They visit youths in placement, work with the placement in achieving treatment

goals, and work with parents toward changes that will ensure the youth's successful return to the community. Supervision continues for a minimum of six months once a youth returns home. Placement coordinators are also responsible for administrative functions (e.g., billing and encumbrances) for non-residential services approved under the CSA. Placement Coordinators also serve as standing members of the Family Assessment and Planning Teams, representing the Juvenile Court.

INTENSIVE SUPERVISION PROGRAM — The Intensive Supervision Program (ISP), which is part of Special Services, was developed in June 1999 and is funded by a federally sponsored Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant. This program provides evening and weekend supervision to youth identified as serious or habitual offenders through SHOCAP and youth on parole/probation who have been identified as high-risk to reoffend through a risk assessment. Three ISP probation officers (2.5 positions) work rotating shifts so that at least one probation officer is monitoring the behavior of these youth in the community each night of the week. They conduct home visits to confirm adherence to curfews and

administer urine screens and Breathalyzer tests. These probation officers provide crisis intervention counseling to families (if needed), submit progress reports to the supervising probation officers, share information with local police departments, and carry portable police radios.

The Intensive Supervision Program will utilize the concept of graduated sanctions in response to non-compliance with probation/parole rules. Depending on the severity of the violation, the probation officers have the option of extending the period of supervision, imposing house arrest with voice verification to monitor compliance through "the Warden" telephone program, and utilizing immediate detention orders with recommended short stays in detention. It is the goal of this program to reduce recidivism while keeping juveniles in the community. Every youth identified as a serious or habitual offender will receive intensive supervision for at least forty-five to ninety days upon their entry into the community or nomination to SHOCAP.

INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM — Section 16.1-278.5 of the Code of Virginia necessitated the establishment of



Judge David Schell and Chief Judge Charles Maxfield.

an interagency team to review and make recommendations on youth adjudicated to be Children In Need of Supervision (truants and runaways), prior to the Court making a final disposition. Members of the Inter-disciplinary Team include: mental health, public schools, alcohol and drug services, Court Services staff and the Department of Human Development. The team is coordinated by the Assistant Director of Family Systems Counseling unit. The purpose of the team is to evaluate a youth's individualized service needs for the Court's consideration in its dispositional findings. Due to the interagency approach and early intervention strategies, the team is able to address a multitude of problems faced by the youth and families.

MAXIMIZE ATTENDANCE PROGRAM (MAP) — In 1997 MAP was developed with grant funds from the Department of Criminal Justice Services to address a correlation between juvenile crime and truancy. Juveniles in this program are supervised by probation officers who monitor their compliance with school attendance requirements and probation rules. Appropriate referrals to the Maximize Attendance Program are juveniles who attend schools supervised by the Center County office, are enrolled in grades seven through twelve, have been identified by the court as habitual truants, have completed some part of the Interdisciplinary Team process, and have been ordered to participate in the program by a judge. Juveniles are placed in the program for six months to a year; the timeframe may be revised depending on the compliance of the juvenile and his/her family. Clients are expected to review, sign, and follow all probation rules and court orders. Lack of compliance may result in the juvenile being returned to court for further sanctions or penalties. Parent participation in the Maximize Attendance Program is important. They are expected to review, sign, and file the Parent Responsibility Form. Additionally, a parent group is available to them.

WORK PROGRAMS

WORK TRAINING PROGRAM — Work training is targeted specifically at juveniles on probation or parole supervision, 14 to 18 years of age. The work training counselor places trainees in county government and non-profit agencies, maintaining periodic contact with the on-site work supervisors and counseling trainees about job-related problems. Trainees usually work from 10 to 20 hours a week, depending upon their school schedules and the needs of the employing agencies, for periods of up to six months. They are paid strictly for hours worked; the Court handles all payroll administration. Although a judge can order a juvenile to get a job, no one can be

ordered to participate in this program and no punitive Court action occurs solely as a result of a youngster's failure in the program. Trainees are treated on the job as regular employees; employers are free to fire them without advance approval from the Court. The counselor provides transitional counseling for participants to assist them in locating employment in the private sector upon completion of the work training program.

COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAM — The Community Service Program (CSP) serves as a resource for the informal hearing officer program and for the judges in sentencing delinquents and Children in Need of Super-vision clients. Originally, the program was designed to serve first and second time mis-demeanants. However, the program is now utilized for more serious felony offenders as well, including violations of probation. The program assigns youngsters to work without pay in a governmental or non-profit agency. Youth are assigned a certain number of hours to perform according to the seriousness and number of offenses for which they are adjudicated not innocent. Those who fail to complete their hours are subject to a show cause order for contempt of court. The program also offers mini-CSP sites that operate on weekends under the supervision of court volunteers to probation violators who are referred for an informal sanction by their probation counselor. Four probation counselors serve as staff for CSP.

EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The Court and the Fairfax County Public Schools' School Board collaborate in operating or supporting a variety of alternative schools for youngsters who are unable to benefit from the ordinary public school experience. Four of these schools were created by joint action of the Court and the School Division. These are: Falls Bridge School in Reston, Hillwood School in Falls Church, Sager School in Fairfax City, Gunston School in Mount Vernon, and Elizabeth Blackwell School.

The Court provides facilities and administrative support, and the Fairfax County Public Schools' School Division provides full-time teachers, books and supplies for each school. Each school has the capacity to handle from eight to ten students under probation supervision by the Court who have experienced behavior and/or attendance problems in school. Students are referred by their probation counselors who closely monitor their attendance in the alternative schools. Students receive individualized remedial instruction, designed to enable them within a year to either return to a regular school,

obtain a high school equivalency diploma, or enroll in a vocational or work-study program. Sager School opened in the fall of 1974, Falls Bridge School in September of 1977, Gunston School (formerly South County School) in November of 1977, and Hillwood School in September of 1985.

ENTERPRISE SCHOOL — The Enterprise School is a private, nonprofit school that provides a therapeutic learning environment for up to 40 juveniles of average and above-average intelligence whose emotional and behavioral problems have prevented them from coping effectively in regular public schools. Students are enrolled in a seven-credit academic program that stresses addressing individual needs within a small group instructional setting. In addition, students participate in biweekly group counseling and are required to participate in monthly multiple-family group counseling sessions with their parents. Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS) Department of Special Education provides six full-time teachers.

VOLUNTEER LEARNING PROGRAM — The Volunteer Learning Program (VLP) was established in 1975. Sponsored jointly by Fairfax County Adult and

Community Education, Fairfax County Juvenile Court, and the Fairfax County Public Library System, it is a tutorial program designed to meet the needs of Fairfax County juveniles and adults who are withdrawn from public school. Consistent with the mission of the Fairfax County Adult and Community Education to provide programs to meet specific educational needs of the adult community, the VLP's goal is to advance the knowledge and skills of its learners as they strive to complete a high school (or equivalent) program. Through participation in one-to-one tutoring sessions, learners acquire increased competency in reading, writing, mathematics, social studies, and science. As they achieve their academic goals, learners develop self-confidence and increased motivation to obtain high school credential, which most often is the GED. The co-sponsors of the VLP share project support. The program is staffed by Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS) with one full-time coordinator, two part-time placement counselors, and one part-time clerical assistant. In addition, FCPS provides educational materials and supplies. Fairfax County Juvenile Court furnishes the office space, and Fairfax County Public Library provides space for tutoring. VLP staff supervises the tutoring program. Volunteers are recruited, trained, and provided with instructional plans and materials. Learners are interviewed, assessed, and then counseled regarding their educational goals. Tutors and learners meet once a week at a local library and work together to achieve specific goals. In addition to assignments to individual learners, tutors are also assigned to FCPS and Court Alternative Schools. Approximately one-eighth of the learners are court-referred; other referrals come from the public schools, other county agencies, and other program participants. Fairfax County's Volunteer Learning Program is a nationally unique and innovative program which combines the resources of community education, juvenile court, and public libraries in order to provide free tutoring services for a diverse population of students. It has been extremely popular with both tutors and learners and enjoys ongoing support from its founding partners.

INDEPENDENT STUDY — In 1992, the Court and Fairfax County Public Schools' School Board developed the Independent Study Program to work with youth on probation or parole. The program is designed to address the educational needs of youths who have been unable to benefit from traditional classroom instruction or alternative school programs. The program's four teachers serve youths who may be pending expulsion, or who may have been expelled but permitted to attend the specialized program by the School Board. The Independent Study Program has educational and work components. Youths



meet with teachers twice each week for school assignments and individual instruction. They are required to find employment to supplement their education. The Court Work Training Program offers job placements to youth enrolled in the program. Program participants may earn high school credit, or prepare for the GED Test.

SCHOOL PROBATION OFFICER PROGRAM — Jointly sponsored by the Court and the Fairfax County Public Schools, teachers in high schools are designated as part-time probation counselors. They work to handle student problems through counseling and referral either before or after the students become involved with the Court. Court probation officers work closely with school staff to assist them in supervision of youth placed on probation.

RESIDENTIAL SERVICES

GIRLS PROBATION HOUSE (GPH) — provides an individualized, structured, and rehabilitative treatment program in the local community for court-involved adolescent females who exhibit chronic behavior problems. With a capacity to serve twelve residents, the target population for GPH are those juveniles whose behavior has brought them to the attention of the court through both CHINS and criminal offenses. Ranging in age from 13 to 17 years old, residents learn, through a point and level behavior modification system, to alter negative, destructive behaviors and adopt more open and positive interactions with their families, peers, and communities.

Two programs are currently being offered at GPH. The Variable Stay Program (with a three- to six-month length of stay) teaches personal responsibility and the value of working together in a group in a positive peer culture. Residents participate in weekly individual, group, and family counseling that is designed to give them maximum support for interrupting a cycle of dysfunctional behavior and trying out new behavior and healthier interactions. Parents are vital partners for their daughters and their families in the change process and must be willing to invest and participate fully in family counseling, a parent group, and program activities. All treatment is designed to facilitate a resident's return to her home and community. The Shelter Care Program varies in length and intensity based upon the needs of shelter care residents, who are placed in the program under judicial order and are often transferred to the Variable Stay Program.

Education is highly valued at GPH; two educators from the Fairfax County Public School System provide

the residents with individually tailored instruction. Most residents are able to view themselves as successful students — often for the first time in their school history. An educational day program offers program graduates the opportunity to complete a semester or school year before returning to their base schools.

BOYS PROBATION HOUSE — The Boys Probation House is a community based, multi-program facility providing non-secure residential treatment to adolescent male offenders with the goal of reducing chronic, acting-out behavior. Two distinct programs are offered. The first is a long-term (9-12 months) therapeutic program that works intensely with the boys and their families to identify and facilitate the changes in behavior necessary for successful return to the home and the community. This program has a capacity of sixteen residents between 14 and 17 years of age. The underlying premise for this program is that less intensive methods of intervention have proven unsuccessful so the establishment of a highly structured, peer-accountable approach is the final intervention before incarceration. The program emphasizes the acceptance of personal responsibility through means of staff supervision, behavior modification, role-modeling, individual, group and family counseling as well as public health education, the use of community mental health centers and local substance abuse treatment services.

The other program offered is the Transitional Living Program, which exposes residents to the demands and difficulties of independent living. This is a five to seven month program that requires residents to work full-time in the community while pursuing their education and while learning the curriculum associated with living on their own. The program has a capacity of six residents who are between 17 and 18 years of age and living at home is no longer an option. The Program Coordinator provides aftercare for each resident. Supervision and supportive services will be given to the residents for 60 days following their completion of the program.

The Fairfax County Public Schools provide three teachers and an aide to conduct year-round classes or G.E.D. instruction in a daily program to address the educational needs for the therapeutic residents. Physical education is also a requirement for the residents.

Figures 28, 29, 30 and 31 provide activity indicators for the Court's specialized and education programs and residential facilities, as well as utilization rates and costs for the residential facilities.

FIGURE 28

**FAMILY COUNSELING AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE
ASSESSMENT UNIT STATISTICS FY 2002**

TYPE OF CASE	COURT-ORDERED	VOLUNTARY	TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
JUVENILE – CASES ASSIGNED				
Delinquent/Chins	62	12	74	43.3%
Interdisciplinary Team Evaluations	94	0	94	55.0%
Diagnostic Team Evaluations	3	0	3	1.8%
TOTAL CASES ASSIGNED	159	12	171	100.0%
DOMESTIC RELATIONS – CASES ASSIGNED				
Adult	17	20	37	45.7%
Custody/Visitation	22	22	44	54.3%
TOTAL CASES ASSIGNED	39	42	81	100.0%
SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES				
Screenings	235	59	294	74.1%
Assessments	103	0	103	25.9%
TOTAL CASES ASSIGNED	338	59	397	100.0%
SEMINARS				
Impact on Separation and Divorce on Families Seminar*	61	19	80	100.0%
TOTAL SEMINARS	61	19	80	100.0%
TOTAL # FAMILIES SEEN FOR FAMILY COUNSELING FY 2002 242				
TOTAL # FAMILIES RECEIVING OTHER SERVICES 735 (Family Systems evaluations, seminars, substance abuse screenings, and assessments, IDT staffings)				
*Reflects number of cases, not number of people. In some cases 1 parent attends, in other cases 2 parents attend.				

FIGURE 29

VOLUNTEER SERVICES, FY 1996-2002

	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002
COURT VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS							
No. of volunteers	430	398	336	360	394	320	346
No. of volunteer-hours	21,764	25,203	21,879	18,226	21,962	15,472	18,256
VOLUNTEER LEARNING PROGRAM							
No. of volunteer tutors	227	233	231	222	173	183	159
No. of volunteer-hours	9,296	9,143	9,242	9,115	9,468	9,977	9,054

FIGURE 30

UTILIZATION AND COSTS OF RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES, FY 2002

FACILITIES	CHILD CARE DAYS	AVG. LENGTH OF STAY FOR THOSE RELEASED	UTILIZATION RATE ¹	COST PER CHILD CARE DAY
Girls Probation House	2,603	84.0	59.4%	\$336.00
Boys Probation House	5,449	136.8	67.9%	\$234.00
Less Secure Shelter	4,057	9.8	92.6%	\$181.00
Juvenile Detention Center ¹	32,825	22.6	74.3%	\$268.00
Supervised Release Services	24,102	34.2	137.6%	\$37.00

¹ Usage by Fairfax County cases only. Placements of youths from other jurisdictions are not included. (Figure includes post dispositional program.)

FIGURE 31

CASELOADS OF PROGRAMS AND RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES FY 1997-2002

COURT PROGRAMS	NUMBER OF CASES ¹					
SPECIALIZED PROGRAMS	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002
Psychological Evaluation (<i>Court Psychologists</i>)	293	368	425	482	508	529
Diagnostic Team	26	11	74	79	104	119
Interdisciplinary Team	120	116	120	152	199	186
Work Training Program	225	236	198	196	201	191
Community Service Project	1,067	1,173	1,163	1,213	1,278	1,437
Family Counseling Program	333	334	411	537	269	242
Substance Abuse Services (<i>screenings and assessments</i>)					306	397
Special Placements Program	41	46	40	32	98	55
Juvenile Traffic School ²	1,167	1,145	1,184	972	1,200	1,051
Court Companion Program	14	18	21	97	*	*
Volunteer Interpreter Program	1,078	1,010	901	1,336	1,602	1,973
EDUCATION PROGRAMS						
Falls Bridge School	22	19	13	16	19	14
Hillwood School	12	11	12	10	8	13
Sager School	38	34	34	12	36	40
Gunston (South County) School	27	35	17	19	22	19
The Enterprise School ³	21	41	32	28	39	44
Volunteer Learning Program ⁴	195	220	226	169	139	155
Independent Study Program	92	98	97	101	100	90
PLACEMENTS ³						
Boys Probation House	57	79	67	50	45	45
Girls Probation House	40	43	25	29	29	36
Outreach Detention	494	501	572	634	800	736
Less Secure Shelter	257	249	238	350	397	420
Juvenile Detention Center	1,595	1,767	1,529	1,584	1,472	1,472

¹ The "number of cases" refers to all cases active on July 1, plus all new cases during the fiscal year.

² Number represents juveniles only.
A parent also attends with each child.

³ Includes Court-referred and non-Court-referred learners.

⁴ Includes Fairfax County cases only.

*Data lost during staff change.

IV. ADULT CASE PROCESSING



DOMESTIC RELATIONS CASE PROCESSING

In November, 1986, Fairfax Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court organized probation services into two separate “tracks:” Juvenile Intake and Probation Services and Domestic Relations Intake and Services. These changes were implemented so people experiencing domestic problems could receive specialized services beginning at the intake level and continuing through the subsequent Court process.

Domestic Relations Services (DRS) handles all adult criminal offenses and family (contested custody, support, visitation and family violence) complaints.

ADULT CRIMINAL CASE PROCESSING

Crimes committed between members of a family and crimes committed by an adult against a juvenile are under the jurisdiction of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court. These offenses are brought to the attention of the Court either by a police officer witnessing an offense or learning of it as a result of an investigation, or by a citizen or member of the family acting as complainant.

If a police officer determines that a crime has been committed between members of a family or by an adult against a juvenile, the adult offender is arrested and brought before the special magistrate. If a member of the family or citizen is acting as complainant, the victim must go before the special magistrate and swear that the person has committed an offense. If the special magistrate believes that there is probable cause that an offense was committed, a warrant is issued and the alleged offender is arrested.

Adult misdemeanor charges under the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court’s jurisdiction are heard in their entirety in the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court. Domestic Relations has six adult probation officers who provide pre-sentencing investigations for the Court and who supervise misdemeanants who are placed on probation. Preliminary hearings are conducted for adult felonies and if the charge is reduced, the entire case is heard. If the charge is not reduced and the preliminary hearing reveals probable cause, the case is referred to the Grand Jury. In FY 2002, the Domestic Relations Unit supervised 391 new adult misdemeanants.

The complaints received against adults in FY 2002 appear in Figure 32. The numbers of new adult complaints from FY 1999-FY 2002 are presented in Figure 33.

FIGURE 32

NEW DOMESTIC RELATIONS CASES FY 2002		
NEW COMPLAINTS	NEW CASES	% OF TOTAL
Civil Support	3,328	38.8%
Capias/Show Cause Rules	2,007	23.4%
Misdemeanors	1,500	17.5%
Domestic Abuse	1,192	13.9%
Felonies	549	6.4%
TOTAL	8,576	100.0%
Source: Virginia Supreme Court Case Management System (CMS).		

FIGURE 33


NEW ADULT COMPLAINTS FY 1999-2002

NEW COMPLAINTS	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002
Misdemeanors	3,291	3,321	3,304	1,500
Felonies	612	552	598	549
Capias/Show Cause	1,673	1,738	1,753	2,007
Support	2,607	2,705	3,123	3,328
Domestic Abuse	825	840	1,008	1,192
TOTAL	9,008	9,156	9,786	8,576

Source: Virginia Supreme Court Case Management System (CMS).

FIGURE 34

ADULT COMPLAINTS, FY 1998-FY 2002



Source: Virginia Supreme Court Case Management System (CMS).

Alleged adult offenders who are arrested early in the day are scheduled for an arraignment hearing the same day. At this hearing the defendant is formally charged, bond conditions are set or a determination regarding release on recognizance is made. The defendant is informed of the right to counsel, which provides for a Court-appointed attorney if the defendant cannot afford one. If the conditions of bond are met by the defendant or if the defendant is released on recognizance (R.O.R.), he or she is released from custody and instructed to appear

before the Court at a later date. If the bond is not posted, the defendant remains in the Fairfax Adult Detention Center. If the arrest occurs when Court is not in session, the special magistrate sets bond or releases the adult on recognizance. If the bond is not met, the defendant is kept in the Adult Detention Center until the next working day, at which time the defendant is brought to Court for arraignment. If withdrawal of the charges is requested by the complainant, the Commonwealth's Attorney's Office must agree to the withdrawal.

Final dispositions available in adult cases include jail sentences and probation. In juvenile cases when a child is over 15 and treated as an adult in Juvenile Court, the same dispositions, including jail sentences, may be used.

Adults who are found guilty in Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court are often referred to Domestic Relations Services for pre-sentencing investigations and probation supervision.

FIGURE 35

DOMESTIC RELATIONS COURT ADULT PROBATION FY 2001 AND FY 2002		
	FY 2001	FY 2002
Average number of new cases per month	26.0	13.8
Total number of new cases served	308	166
Total number of cases closed	239	436
Total number of cases closed successfully	225 (94.1%)	420 (96.3%)

ADULT COMPLAINTS




SUMMARY OF HIGHLIGHTS

The Court began using data from the Virginia Supreme Court Case Management System (CMS) in FY 2002. This switch caused significant drops in some types of adult complaints.

- ★ The Court received a total of 8,576 adult complaints in FY 2002, an increase of five percent over the 8,165 complaints received in FY 2000.
- ★ Support and domestic violence complaints composed 13.9 percent of all adult complaints received.
- ★ Domestic relations complaints increased 9.4 percent from 4,131 in FY 2001 to 4,520 in FY 2002. These complaints include issues of non-support and domestic violence.
- ★ Misdemeanor complaints decreased by 54.6 percent, from 3,304 in FY 2001 to 1,500 in FY 2002.
- ★ There was an 8.2 percent decrease in the number of felony offense complaints this year, from 598 in FY 2001 to 549 in FY 2002.

FIGURE 36

TRENDS IN TYPES OF NEW ADULT COMPLAINTS FY 1999-FY 2002



SUPPORT, CUSTODY AND VISITATION COMPLAINT CASE PROCESSING

The most common adult offense, and the one with the highest incidence of recidivism, is non-support. This is usually a civil matter rather than a criminal charge. Persons who need support from a spouse or the parent of their children, may file a petition for support through the Domestic Relations Services intake department. The intake officer will authorize a petition and obtain a court date.

Outgoing and incoming UIFSA cases (Uniform Interstate Family Support Act) are filed when the petitioner and respondent live in different states. In an out-going reciprocal, a petitioner will file for support against an individual in another state. The petitioner then appears before a judge to swear that the contents of the petition are true. The Court sends the petition to the court having jurisdiction where the respondent is in residence. If the respondent is located by the other court, that court has the responsibility for entering and enforcing an order. An incoming reciprocal is the

opposite of an outgoing reciprocal. A petitioner in another state files against a respondent in Fairfax County. The Court sets a hearing at which time the respondent is placed under an order.

Division of Child Support Enforcement (D.C.S.E.), a State agency, processes all out-going UIFSA child support petitions. Domestic Relations Services processes out-going UIFSA spousal support petitions.

Support payments for all UIFSA cases are processed through D.C.S.E. and that agency is responsible for enforcement of the child support orders. The Commonwealth's Attorney's Office enforces spousal support orders.

Orders involving child or spousal support which are made in the Circuit Court as a result of divorce or pre-divorce actions can be delegated to the Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court for enforcement and

modification. Finally, support orders can result from a juvenile action when the custody of a juvenile is granted to someone other than the legal parents; the judge may order that the legal parents pay support for their child to the guardians, or to the residential facility where the child has been placed.

At the request of the petitioner or respondent, local orders may also require that payments be collected by D.C.S.E. A petitioner may also request enforcement services from that agency.

If payments are made directly to the payee (instead of through D.C.S.E.), the petitioner is responsible for enforcing the order. To do this, motions for wage assignments, contempt proceedings and other enforcement mechanisms are filed through Domestic Relations Services.

FIGURE 37

SUPPORT ACCOUNTS AND AMOUNTS COLLECTED FOR SUPPORT, FINES, COSTS, AND RESTITUTION, FY 1989-2002


YEAR	RESTITUTION COLLECTED	FINES COLLECTED	COSTS COLLECTED	FINES & COSTS COLLECTED
1989	\$92,797.60	\$388,540.78	\$147,781.96	\$536,322.74
1990	87,460.80	288,906.66	166,252.94	455,159.60
1991	95,284.00	324,808.90	175,803.02	500,611.92
1992	105,101.57	280,429.00	118,900.00	399,329.00
1993	95,435.39	263,085.66	163,229.86	426,315.52
1994	67,962.60	254,944.28	159,850.35	414,794.63
1995	125,901.96	268,617.76	189,467.72	458,085.48
1996	142,392.33	308,109.06	214,095.32	522,204.38
1997	173,975.18	349,227.73	240,620.55	589,848.28
1998	203,852.13	373,242.60	245,701.68	618,944.28
1999	193,668.17	333,311.83	264,721.38	598,033.21
2000	196,109.60	368,023.73	275,437.16	643,460.89
2001	154,574.00	316,686.39	205,507.74	522,194.13
2002	202,978.00	290,558.20	204,234.03	494,792.23

Custody and visitation issues are processed in the same manner as local support matters, with an attempt made to mediate a settlement whenever possible. Any agreements reached in support, custody and visitation matters can be entered as an order of the Court in the form of a consent order. When custody or visitation problems go to trial, the judge sometimes orders a home study, which is an investigation of the physical, emotional and educational needs of the children and the ability of each parent to meet those needs. The custody investigator submits a report to the court prior to the dispositional hearing and testifies at the hearing. The Code of Virginia prohibits an intake officer from denying petitions for custody, support and visitation. However, an intake officer does point out jurisdictional and venue issues and explains options to the petitioners.

FAMILY ABUSE

Since 1984, persons who have been physically abused by a family member can obtain a civil protective order in Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court. The victim of abuse discusses the problems with an intake counselor who then draws up an affidavit and petition. If the petitioner is in imminent danger of further abuse, the judge may sign a temporary protective order pending a full court hearing. Fairfax County Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court has counselors who specialize in assisting families who are experiencing domestic violence. The Domestic Violence Intake Officer does the intake work and provides other advisory and counseling services. In FY 1993, a Code change went into effect which broadened the definition of family when referring to domestic disputes to include non-related people living together.

FIGURE 38



V. RESEARCH, INFORMATION AND TRAINING



JUVENILE COURT GRANTS

Court's research staff provided proposal development, reporting and evaluation support for several multi-year grants awarded by the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS). Three of the grant programs support specialized services for juveniles — the Young Offender Program, the Juvenile Sex Offender Program, and the Intensive Supervision Program for serious and habitual offenders. A joint grant to the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court and the General District Court from the Comprehensive Community Corrections Act provides supervision for adult offenders.

YOUNG OFFENDER PROGRAM — In FY 2002, the Court Services Unit received a five-year grant from the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services to develop an intervention program for adjudicated offenders age thirteen or younger who have been placed in detention or shelter care. Funds provide a case manager and a menu of short-term, contract treatment services.

The program is designed to provide in depth, timely assessment of both youth and family, to initiate immediate, age-appropriate interventions, and to link the youth and family to longer term services if necessary. Grant activities also help educate staff in the characteristics of child delinquents and their service needs.

JUVENILE SEX OFFENDER PROGRAM — In October 2002, the Fairfax County Juvenile Court Services unit was awarded funds from the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) to participate in the replication of a broad-

based model for enhanced juvenile sex offender treatment that has been developed by Dr. John Hunter at the University of Virginia. The approach is based on the social-ecological perspective that emphasizes the importance of treating youth in the context of family and community. The program builds on existing services and adds intensive assessment, intensive supervision, small caseloads, and home-based family intervention. This program has been a significant addition to the Court's capacity to serve this population.

INTENSIVE SUPERVISION PROGRAM — The Federal Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant (JAIBG) program provides grants to States and units of local government to enhance their efforts to combat serious and violent juvenile crime and to promote greater accountability in the juvenile justice system. A local JAIBG grant was awarded to the County in January 1999. The Court has used these funds to establish an Intensive Supervision Program (ISP) to address the increasing needs of the probation department to monitor high risk youth on probation.

COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS ACT (CCCA) — The Juvenile Court portion of the Comprehensive Community Corrections Act (CCCA) grant funds three Probation Counselor II positions. These counselors are responsible for supervising adult misdemeanor offenders ordered to complete anger management courses, and/or other community-based programs. All offenders are eligible for jail and are facing criminal charges.

FINDINGS FROM RESEARCH STUDIES AND REPORTS

The Research Analysts in the Court Director's Office completed several studies and reports during the year. A brief description and highlights of findings follow. Copies of full reports are available upon request from the Department of Research and Development.

★ EVALUATION OF DOMESTIC RELATIONS COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS ADULT PROBATION

These reports evaluated the program operations, cases handled, and recidivism of cases processed by the Domestic Relations Court Adult Probation Unit, which serves a population of men and women under court-ordered probation. Two positions in this unit are funded by the Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS). In FY 2001, the program handled an average of 26 new cases per month. Year-end data showed that the J&DR Court served a total of 308 new cases during the year. At the end of FY 2001, 239 cases had been closed. Out of these cases, 225 (94.1%) had closed successfully. Therefore, the objective that 80% of family violence defendants comply with the conditions of their court orders was achieved.

In FY 2002, the program handled an average of 13.8 new cases per month. Year-end data showed that the J&DR Court served a total of 166 new cases during the year. At the end of FY 2002, 436 cases had been closed. Out of these cases, 420 (96.3%) had closed successfully. Therefore, the objective that 80% of family violence defendants comply with the conditions of their court orders was achieved.

★ DOMESTIC RELATIONS CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY

The survey was designed collaboratively by the Research and Development Unit and the Domestic Relations Unit. The survey questions collected demographic information such as sex and race as well as the reason for the clients' visit. Questions attempted to measure how long clients had to wait for services and whether they were satisfied with their services. A total of 238 surveys were gathered between August and September of 2000 and between June 18, 2001 and July 12, 2001.

Overall, the results of the survey were positive. Most clients (98.7 percent) that visited the Domestic Relations Unit said they were satisfied with the services they received. In addition to being satisfied

with services received, many clients (97.9 percent) also felt welcomed by the worker that handled their case. Reasons for client visits varied, 55.3 percent of respondents came to the Domestic Relations Office regarding custody issues, 54.9 percent for child support issues; 33.8 percent of respondents for visitation issues, 11 percent for protective orders, and 6.8 percent for general information.

★ SAFE PROGRAM REPORT

An evaluation of the Substance/Alcohol Focused Education (Safe) Program was completed in FY 2002. The SAFE Program is a collaborative effort of the Fairfax County Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court, INOVA Fairfax Hospital, and the Fairfax County Alcohol Safety Action Program (ASAP). The Court began ordering juveniles into the program in August of 1999. The four-stage, ten-hour program is designed for juveniles under the age of 18 who are charged with first-time alcohol or drug offenses. The four-stages include: Orientation and Assessment; Medical Examiner Presentation; Trauma Center visit; and an Alcohol/Drug Workshop for the juvenile and a separate session for their parent or guardian.

Over 80 percent of youth in the Safe Program had no new charges. A time frame for new offenses analyzed three separate periods. In each group, the number of days was calculated to determine the length of time between the court disposition date and the date of the new offense had passed. Three categories of time were selected: (1) Three months from the Safe charge disposition date to the date of any new offenses (1-90 days); (2) Between three months and one year of disposition (91-360 days) from the court disposition date to the date of any new offenses; (3) and over one year from the Safe charge disposition date (361 or more days).

The Safe Program has other specific benefits compared to the array of sentencing options being used for first time drug/alcohol offenders prior to the implementation of the Safe program. The Safe intervention provides a systematic and uniform response to this type of offense, unlike the prior dispositions that were highly variable. The Safe Program provides a detailed educational component as well as a sanction. Parents are involved with their child. With this program, the Court and community provide a "united front" in their response to first time drug and alcohol use. This program provides more of a treatment approach that is consistent with the current emphasis on specialized responses such as drug courts.

VI. COMMENTS ON THE DATA



The statistics presented in this report are primarily derived from the JUVARE system. They are as accurate as the system will allow. Since 1976, when the system was initiated, the Court's functions and procedures have expanded and there have been tremendous technological advancements in the computer industry. Over JUVARE's 23 year history, the system has experienced a continual expansion in scope and improvements in operational efficiency. However, the merger with the CMS system has had some effect on the way complaint and service data is reported by JUVARE. The most serious effect has been the under reporting of adult offenses.

The data presented reflect not only the Court's activities but also the demographic characteristics of Fairfax County. Over the past several years, the County's population has increased to just under one million residents.

During the 1980s the juvenile "at risk" population in the County (defined as youth in grades 5 through 12 in the Fairfax County Public Schools) had been decreasing, as it had throughout most of the country. Since FY 1991, this population has been increasing. The at risk population increased 27.9% between FY 1990 and FY 2001, going from 163,017 to 208,529 youth.

As the total county population continues to rise, the non-juvenile population has also grown. Corresponding shifts in types of complaints to the Court have occurred. Child support and custody complaints represented 41.0% of all juvenile non-traffic complaints in FY 2002. Support and domestic violence complaints composed 13.9% of all adult complaints received in FY 2002. Juvenile delinquency and CHINS complaints accounted for 44.5% of the total non-traffic complaints in FY 2002.

